

# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

---

June, 1955

---

ILSE APPELBAUM GRAHAM. <i>The Broken Pitcher: Hero of Kleist's Comedy</i> . . . . .	99
ROBERT J. CLEMENTS. <i>Princes and Literature: A Theme of Renaissance Emblem Books</i> . . . . .	114
B. FRANK SEDWICK. <i>Rivas' 'Don Alvaro' and Verdi's 'La forza del destino'</i> . . . . .	124
ROBERT R. BOYLE, S.J. <i>The Imagery of 'Macbeth,' I, vii, 21-28</i> . . . . .	130
LODWICK HARTLEY. <i>Cowper and the Polygamous Parson</i> . . . . .	137
THEODORE B. DOLMATCH. <i>Notes and Queries Concerning the Revisions in 'Finnegans Wake'</i> . . . . .	142
JOHN J. PARRY and PAUL A. BROWN. <i>A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1954</i> . . . . .	149
REVIEWS . . . . .	170
BOOKS RECEIVED . . . . .	189

---

Volume Sixteen

Number Two

---

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS  
SEATTLE

# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Edited by

EDWARD GODFREY COX  
*Managing Editor*

EMILY E. JOHNSON  
*Editorial Associate*

DUDLEY D. GRIFFITH

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

ABRAHAM C. KELLER

*Direct Contributions and Business Correspondence to*  
Managing Editor, Modern Language Quarterly  
Parrington Hall  
University of Washington  
Seattle 5

Subscription price \$3.50 per year • Single copies \$1.00  
Issued in March, June, September, December

Indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*

Entered as second-class matter May 6, 1940, at the post office at Seattle, Washington,  
under the Act of March 3, 1879

PRINTED IN U. S. A.







# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Volume Sixteen

June, 1955

Number Two

## ARTICLES

Ilse Appelbaum Graham. The Broken Pitcher: Hero of Kleist's Comedy .....	99
Robert J. Clements. Princes and Literature: A Theme of Renaissance Emblem Books.....	114
B. Frank Sedwick. Rivas' <i>Don Alvaro</i> and Verdi's <i>La forza del destino</i> .....	124
Robert R. Boyle, S.J. The Imagery of <i>Macbeth</i> , I, vii, 21-28.....	130
Lodwick Hartley. Cowper and the Polygamous Parson .....	137
Theodore B. Dolmatch. Notes and Queries Concerning the Revisions in <i>Finnegans Wake</i> .....	142
John J. Parry and Paul A. Brown. A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1954.....	149

## REVIEWS

William Elton (editor). <i>Aesthetics and Language</i> [John Wilcox].....	170
Henry A. Person (editor). <i>Cambridge Middle English Lyrics</i> [Richard H. Green].....	171
George F. Sensabaugh. <i>That Grand Whig Milton</i> [Allen R. Benham] .....	171
Charles R. Metzger. <i>Emerson and Greenough</i> [Frederic I. Carpenter] .....	173
Linguistic Bibliography for the Year 1952 [Carroll E. Reed]....	174
Roy Pascal. <i>The German Sturm und Drang</i> [Curtis C. D. Vail] ..	174
Raymond M. Immerwahr. <i>The Esthetic Intent of Tieck's Fantastic Comedy</i> [Percy Matenko].....	176
H. W. Belmore. <i>Rilke's Craftsmanship</i> [H. F. Peters] .....	178

Walter Laedrach (editor). Führer zu Gotthelf und Gotthelfstätten [ <i>Egon Schwarz</i> ]	180
Oskar Seidlin (editor). Der Briefwechsel Arthur Schnitzler- Otto Brahm [ <i>Henry Hatfield</i> ]	181
Fernand Desonay. Ronsard poète de l'amour. Livre II: De Marie à Genève [ <i>Samuel F. Will</i> ]	181
Lester G. Crocker. The Embattled Philosopher; Two Diderot Studies [ <i>J. Robert Loy</i> ]	184
Walter T. Pattison. Benito Pérez Galdós and the Creative Process [ <i>J. Chalmers Herman</i> ]	188
Books Received	189

## THE BROKEN PITCHER: HERO OF KLEIST'S COMEDY

By ILSE APPELBAUM GRAHAM

Jesus said unto him, Thomas, because thou  
hast seen me, thou hast believed: Blessed are  
they that have not seen, and yet believed.  
(John 20:29)

Was ich mit Händen greife, glaub ich gern.  
(*Der Zerbrochene Krug*, Scene IX)

"Erlaubt! Wie schön der Krug, gehört zur Sache!—" cries the plaintiff, Frau Marthe, as the village judge asks her to spare the court further details of her "zerscherbte Paktum." And although the speaker is but a character in a play, and not a very bright one at that, we may assume that in defending the importance of her pitcher Frau Marthe is speaking on behalf of the dramatist. For the broken pitcher is nothing less than the titular hero of this drama and as such eminently worthy of attention. A strange hero, it is true: a dumb thing of clay, unable to protest its significance; a congenital affliction which has earned it the contemptuous disregard of the characters in the play and the smiling forbearance of its critics. A mere trifle it has been called time and again; and one critic has built up an elaborate theory proving that it has no business to be in the drama at all.<sup>1</sup> Others have added insult to injury by arguing that its very insignificance is its *raison d'être*: for the discrepancy between its real nullity and the ado it causes is the mainspring of the comedy.<sup>2</sup>

Clearly this is no way to treat a hero. And, indeed, the broken pitcher has avenged itself by taking the secret of the play into its silent grave. For what has become of this play of which the poet himself could say at the close of his life: "es kann auch, aber nur für einen sehr kritischen Freund, für eine Tinte meines Wesens gelten"?<sup>3</sup> Many think it delightful, some find it ponderous even in its playfulness. But most are agreed that, born of the poet's will to prove his comic vein, it remains a product of his skill rather than his genius and lacks something of that formidable integrity so characteristic of his masterpieces; a judgment which is reflected in the extensiveness of the objections advanced even by its most well-meaning critics.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. Meyer-Benfey, *Das Drama H. von Kleist* (Göttingen, 1911), pp. 448, 483.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., Curt Hohoff, *Komik und Humor bei Heinrich von Kleist* (Berlin, 1937), p. 44. Cf. also Friedrich Gundolf, *Heinrich von Kleist* (Berlin, 1924), pp. 69 f.

<sup>3</sup> Letter to Fouqué, April 25, 1811. Kleist's *Werke*, ed. Waetzold, VI, No. 65. For further quotations from Kleist's letters this edition is used.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. especially Meyer-Benfey, *op. cit.* For a predominantly negative attitude cf. Friedrich Gundolf, *op. cit.*, p. 44; Roger Ayrault, *Heinrich von Kleist* (Paris, 1934), pp. 502 ff.; Julius Forssmann, *Rationalismus und Intuition in H. von Kleists Seelenhaltung und Dichtung* (Riga, 1928), p. 20. Significantly, such brilliant studies as Gerhard Fricke, *Gefühl und Schicksal bei Heinrich von*

Thus either Kleist overrated his play, or we have yet to find its organic center. But in what direction is the would-be critical friend of the poet to turn for a clue? Kleist's letter to Fouqué continues thus: "es ist nach dem Tenier gearbeitet, und würde nichts werth sein, käme es nicht von Einem, der in der Regel lieber dem göttlichen Raphael nachstrebt." The epithet *göttlich* sums up the associations evoked by the mention of Raphael: a name epitomizing a grace so perfect as to transcend almost the limits of physical nature, the very law of gravity. And Tenier, the robust painter of the rustic world in which Kleist has set his comedy? Surely he denotes the very opposite. Yet some connection between these two poles there must be. Even in the portrait after the manner of the Dutchman some trace of the divine Italian must linger: for it is that which gives the likeness its worth. But wherein can the connection lie? What did Tenier mean to Kleist?

At this point the essay *Über das Marionettentheater* comes to mind. Written in December, 1810, a few months before the poet dispatched his comedy to Fouqué together with his judgment about it, the essay recounts Kleist's reminiscences of a puppet show he purports to have seen during the winter of 1801, a month or two before *Der Zerbrochene Krug* took shape in his mind. It relates how Kleist, on being asked by a dancer whether he did not think those puppets extraordinarily graceful, had replied that indeed "eine Gruppe von vier Bauern, die nach einem raschen Tanz die Ronde tanzte, hätte von Tenier nicht hübscher gemalt werden können." So Tenier too—and the comedy after the manner of Tenier—in the poet's mind is associated with a certain kind of grace; the grace, as we learn in the course of the essay, of the puppet, of the youth who unwittingly imitated a Greek statue, and of the bear who instinctively parried every stroke of his human masters; that is to say, the natural grace which precedes consciousness and is destroyed by its advent; the grace of innocence—so the poet sums it up—in which we live as in paradise until we eat from the tree of knowledge, and to which we shall return when we have transcended the shortcomings of human consciousness. It is a far cry from the *Gliedermann* to the *Gott*, and yet, the poet tells us, the two meet like intersecting lines converging in infinity. And a far cry it seems from the dumb earthiness of Frau Marthe's world—Tenier's world—to that "letzte Kapitel von der Geschichte der Welt," the chapter of paradise regained, which forms the theme of the *Marionettentheater*.

Yet paradise and the loss of innocence must have played a large part in the conversations between the four young writers which resulted in Kleist's comedy. For *innocence perdue* was the theme suggested by Greuze's painting *La cruche cassée* and elaborated in Debucourt's *Kleist* (Berlin, 1929), and Hanna Hellmann, *Heinrich von Kleist, das Problem seines Lebens und seiner Dichtung* (Heidelberg, 1910), do not discuss the comedy. For more positive views cf. Walter Muschg, *Kleist* (Zürich, 1923); J. C. Blankenagel, *Dramas of Heinrich von Kleist* (Chapel Hill, 1931); Friedrich Braig, *Heinrich von Kleist* (München, 1925); E. L. Stahl, *Heinrich von Kleist's Dramas* (Oxford, 1948).

painting, an engraving of which hung in Zschokke's room in Berne. And paradise lost, *innocence perdue*, is indeed the theme of Zschokke's short story and Gessner's idyll.<sup>5</sup> Critics have told us that Kleist dropped these thematic associations. But what about the nomenclature of his play: Adam and Eve? Again we are assured that these names, like the pitcher itself, are relics from an earlier conception and have no legitimate place in the play as we know it.<sup>6</sup> Small wonder that, with its titular hero and two principal personages thus lightly dismissed, the drama still refuses to yield up the secret of its life. The poet's own words, at any rate, encourage us to look for such a secret. It is true, we have garnered no more than a few pieces of circumstantial evidence; and circumstantial evidence, a tricky enough instrument to wield in a court of law, is more unsuited still to extract the truth from poetry. To do so, we must examine the drama itself. We must interrogate its silent hero, the broken pitcher, and through the offices of its interpreter, Frau Marthe, seek to discover its real significance.

Four times does the broken pitcher dominate the scene by proxy, as it were: in the preliminary squabble about the legal aspect of the breakage, in Frau Marthe's description of its beauty, in her account of its history, and finally, and appropriately, in the concluding words of the play. All these are eminently funny passages. But wherein does their humor lie? In the case of her quibble with Veit this is not difficult to see. Clearly, it revolves on her play on the words *entscheiden*, *ersetzen*, and *entschädigen* (Scene VI). She reduces each of Veit's statements *ad absurdum*, by reducing the operative word to the concrete meaning of its stem. *Entscheiden* to her means, quite literally, to un-sever the jug, in the sense in which it is severed; *ersetzen*, to put it back into place, in the sense in which it is dislocated; *entschädigen*, to un-damage it in the sense in which it is damaged. By taking the words in this literal meaning, she proves Veit guilty of many contradictions in terms. For what is done cannot be undone. But this is not the sense in which we do use these derivatives. Contrary to their stem words *scheiden*, *setzen*, *schädigen*, they express, not a modification of the object itself, but rather a relation between the people concerned with the object. And this is, of course, the sense in which Veit uses them. He proposes, not to mend, place back, or un-damage the jug, but to make amends to its owner, to replace it to her, or otherwise to indemnify her.

The breakage of the jug has created a complex situation requiring an ability to distinguish between different levels of reality. On one plane,

<sup>5</sup> The pitcher in the novel is adorned with a scene from the Garden of Eden, and its breakage gives rise to lamentations about the fall from grace, while Gessner's jug represents the adventures of the gods and goddesses of a prehuman mythological age.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Meyer-Benfey, *op. cit.*, p. 488. Karl Siegen, *Heinrich von Kleist und Der Zerbrochene Krug* (Sondershausen, 1879), notes the connection between Zschokke's short story and Kleist's nomenclature, but does not pursue the matter any further.

the broken jug is an isolated material fact. On another, it is an object of contention and a factor in a human issue. On this plane, it is a thing of moral and legal significance with an abiding reality altogether distinct from its physical existence. It is on this plane that the words Veit uses are meaningful. By denying their meaning and consistently regressing to the concrete sense of their stem components, Frau Marthe reveals a curious limitation of her mind. She is unable, it seems, to distinguish between the material and the moral aspect of an issue, between things and their significance; indeed she seems unable to conceive of any mode of reality beyond the tangible and visible one of the material world.

The same mode of perception informs Frau Marthe's description of the jug in the seventh scene. The material properties of the jug itself, the representation on it, and the historical world which is represented—these are three distinct things betokening so many orders of reality. And here again Frau Marthe is incapable of differentiating between them, indeed of recognizing any reality beyond the tangible one of the material object before her. Thus, in describing the picture on the jug and the historical events to which it refers, she falls into a hopeless confusion which is brought out in a number of ways: by her incessant use of adverbs of time and place, such as *hier, grade hier, noch, jetzt*, etc., she reduces the historical time and place of the pictured events, as well as the timelessness of the picture itself, to the temporal and spatial dimension in which her jug has, or had, its being. Again, throughout her long description she does not once make reference to the fact that she is describing a pictorial representation. It is not the material properties of the figure of King Philipp, but the august personage of the latter himself which now "*liegt im Topf bis auf den Hinterteil.*" Similarly, she does not inform us that the surrender of the Dutch Provinces is depicted or shown on the jug: on Frau Marthe's jug the Dutch Provinces in their massive entirety are, in fact, surrendered.

Were it not for the fact that the pitcher is broken, such verbal contractions might conceivably pass for mere colloquialisms. But it is broken, and consequently Frau Marthe's mode of expression leads her to speak of the entire Dutch Provinces being surrendered, not on the jug, but "*hier grade auf dem Loch, wo jetzo nichts.*" This is ludicrous. The complicated situation which has arisen necessitates a differentiation not absolutely requisite before. For once the jug is broken, the bond between its material and its pictorial properties is hopelessly disrupted. They have ceased to be expressive of each other, and thus can no longer be expressed in terms of one another. By disregarding this cleavage between its sundered elements, Frau Marthe's description of the pitcher lapses from the merely naïve into the absurd.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> It is curious that critics have time and again taken this grotesque description at its face value, hailing or condemning it, without discerning the underlying point of its absurdity. Meyer-Benfey condemns the passage on the ground that it is "*eine starke Zumutung an unsere Phantasie, uns auf der Wölbung eines Kruges*

And indeed, the poet has found a drastic device to underscore this incomprehension. For he has led her into a perpetual confusion of the laws appertaining to the material and the pictorial spheres of the shattered pitcher. The Queens of France and Hungary, one of whom can still be seen to weep, now lament the loss of their earthenware legs; Philibert, the rascal who has permitted the Emperor to take the brunt of Ruprecht's blow, by rights should fall, like his master; a curious onlooker is still peering from his window: goodness knows what he now sees; the Bishop of Arras has altogether gone to the devil, only his shadow has remained behind. Now ordinarily the continued presence of that gentleman's painted shadow would prompt the recognition that it is merely his embossed likeness which has vanished. Not so Frau Marthe. Not even the fact that what she describes is contrary to the laws of nature—a shadow without an owner—induces her to abandon her way of thinking and to recognize that she is confusing two distinct orders of reality.

In the earlier scene Frau Marthe equates the legal and moral aspects of the breakage with the physical fact itself. The same inability to differentiate causes her, in the present scene, to identify the pictorial values of the jug with its material properties. The immediate physical reality, it seems, is the only reality which she can see.

For a third time in the play the pitcher holds the stage when through the mouth of Frau Marthe we learn its varied history. Its survival through the hazards of fightings, falls, and fire, underlined by the increasingly dismal fate that overtakes its owners, is so strange as to be little short of incredible; and gradually it becomes clear that she believes her jug to be endowed with supernatural powers. Yet how do we come by this knowledge?

So terse is Frau Marthe's account of the first incident that we have hardly time to wonder how the jug escaped destruction. In the act of killing its owner, the *Wassergeuse* seizes it, drinks, and is off. Nor does Frau Marthe dwell on the miraculous nature of her second story,

---

eine so ausgedehnte, figurenreiche Darstellung auszumalen, die den großen Marktplatz mit Häusern und Kirchenpforten und darauf das Gewimmel so zahlreicher, einzeln erkennbarer Gestalten umfaßt" (*op. cit.*, p. 483). We are not asked to identify ourselves with what Frau Marthe describes, but to note the characteristics of her mode of perception. The representation on the jug itself is by no means impossibly detailed; it is no more crowded than many a medieval painting or Renaissance bas-relief. It is Frau Marthe's account of this representation which distorts the perspective and creates the effect of an impossible crowding. This effect is achieved by the reduction of the vast historical reality that is represented to the scale of the material representation with which it is identified. It is an entirely deliberate effect created to provoke us into the awareness of Frau Marthe's typical response. Similarly, Blankenagel misses the point when he praises Frau Marthe's description as "a masterpiece. . . . The figures fairly seem to step forth from their background, endowed with life and colorful individuality" (*op. cit.*, p. 119). Blankenagel does not see that this description far exceeds the limits of what can legitimately be addressed as a realistic account, and that its whole function lies, not in giving us a vivid impression of the pitcher or the picture on it, but in characterizing Frau Marthe's mode of perception.



the story of the aged owner of the jug and the amazing rejuvenation it works on him. On the contrary, she goes out of her way to stress the gravedigger's exceptional sobriety: "Der trank zu dreimal nur, der Nüchterne, / Und stets vermischt mit Wasser, aus dem Krug—" and thence, without so much as a hint of discrepancy, she proceeds to relate the results of his chastity: the gravedigger takes a young wife, becomes a father, "Und als sie jetzt noch fünfzehn Kinder zeugte, / Trank er zum dritten Male, als sie starb." These momentous events, especially the wife's death when we expect to hear of the end of her aged husband, are comical in themselves. Their surprise effect is enhanced by the manner of the telling: Frau Marthe relates them perfunctorily, in two subordinate clauses. But to say this is not fully to account for the superbly funny effect of these lines. Had Frau Marthe said, more correctly, "*Nachdem* sie jetzt noch fünfzehn Kinder zeugte, / Trank er zum dritten Male, als sie starb," their force would have been considerably weakened. The poet clinches his point by using the same tense for two temporal clauses relating successive events. By this token the happenings are telescoped and belittled, as it were. A suppressed miracle if ever there was one, the feat of Fürchtegott's old age!

But it is in her account of the two last and most extraordinary hazards of the jug that Frau Marthe reaches the nadir of matter-of-factness. To save the jug from the French, its next owner threw it out of the window and jumped after it. The jug remained whole while the owner broke his neck, "der Ungeschickte." This disapprobation is the key to Frau Marthe's attitude. For it implies that for the tailor to have landed intact would have been no more than natural and fitting. Anybody should have been able to do what a mere jug could do: "Und dieser irdne Krug, der Krug von Ton / Aufs Bein kam er zu stehen und blieb ganz." Thus she takes the miracle out of its survival. And indeed, the true nature of the event and her incomprehension of it are pointed up in yet another way. Frau Marthe protests that the story was told by the dead man himself! A paradox more glaring than the survival of her earthenware jug, and yet she is unaware of it!

It is in her last story, however, that the incongruity between event and evaluation culminates: the story of the jug's escape from fire. Three times do we hear of the great conflagration of "Anno sechsundsechzig." By such reiteration and by everyone's evident familiarity with the event its magnitude is impressed on us. We imagine a horrible disaster recorded in the pages of history. And what befell your jug in this catastrophe, Frau Marthe is asked; she replies, "Was ihm geschehen? / Nichts ist dem Krug, ich bitt euch sehr, ihr Herrn, / Nichts Anno sechsundsechzig ihm geschehn." The reiterated negative and the monotonous repetitiveness of the phrase as a whole do their work: our expectations are deflated like a pricked balloon.

The source of the humor of Frau Marthe's stories is evident. As



before, it arises from her inability to comprehend an order of reality beyond the palpable physical reality of the jug itself. This time it is the religious reality of her jug which escapes her. Its supernatural properties, like its moral and aesthetic properties, are something over and above its material nature and distinct from it. Indeed, unlike the latter, its supernatural properties are paradoxically opposed to its material nature. It is precisely that opposition which marks Frau Marthe's jug as an object of faith. Frau Marthe's faith is funny in that it is totally unconscious of its own paradoxical character and is based, not on the unseen spiritual nature of the jug, but directly upon its physical properties. Objectively speaking, it is more comical than her moral assessment and her aesthetic appreciation, in that the failure to perceive a paradox is more complete than the failure to perceive a distinction. Thus the triad of scenes we have examined culminates in the history of the jug with which it concludes. For it is here that the limitations of Frau Marthe's mode of perception are most glaringly exposed.<sup>8</sup>

Having thus defined Frau Marthe's mentality and its comic propensities, the critic faces an ugly prospect: at any moment he may be told that the joke is on him. He may be laughed at for invoking the abstract pomp of moral, aesthetic, and religious categories in order to explain so dumb a creature as Frau Marthe. Yet this is precisely what the poet has done, in the oblique and unobtrusive fashion which is the poet's triumph and the critic's envy. For how else was Kleist to characterize Frau Marthe's obtuseness, but by showing her inability to recognize any form of spiritual reality beyond the common reality of material things? And if he was to keep within the narrow confines of his comic character, what could he do but let this inarticulateness speak for itself, without pointer or comment, at the risk that it might not make itself understood? It was essential for the poet to perform this delicate operation successfully; for Frau Marthe's mental make-up is the key to her actual behavior, and it is this, more than any other factor, which determines the outer action of the play.

It has been remarked that Frau Marthe is inordinately concerned about her pitcher, while to the real issue, Eve's happiness and honor, she seems impervious. "Er?" she exclaims, when the identity of the nocturnal intruder is revealed; and from that moment onward she lapses into a virtually complete silence which she breaks only to announce, at the end of the play, that she will go to Utrecht there to seek

<sup>8</sup> Adam's humor too springs from his failure to acknowledge a spiritual reality beyond the palpable reality of material things. But, contrary to Frau Marthe, his failure is caused, not by an inability to recognize spiritual values, but by his unwillingness to submit to their discipline. His is an out and out materialism and opportunism. An exhaustive study of the comic in Kleist's play would necessitate a separate examination of Adam. A study of its thematic structure can dispense with this. The prime mover of the outer action, Adam remains on the fringe of a poetic theme which is concerned with the failure of faith rather than with its deliberate denial.

justice for her damaged jug. Clearly Eve's vindication has made no impression on her. Yet care for Eve's honor she does; and in what way is revealed by the form and imagery of her final invective: "Und auf den Scheiterhaufen das Gesindel, / Wenn's deine Ehre weißzubrennen gilt / Und diesen Krug hier wieder zu glasieren!" (Scene VI). The disparateness of the two issues—the moral and the material—is ignored. Both are treated on the same footing, in a single sentence. Two object clauses coupled by "und" and sharing the same verb are made to cover the diverse aspects of the case. What is more, both the moral and the material are expressed in terms of the same imagery. And the image, significantly, is taken from the sphere of the material object!

Signs such as these indicate that Frau Marthe's reaction to the practical situation is consonant with her response in those reflective moments in which the essential shape of her mind has been revealed. Indeed, her present predicament is very much like the intellectual predicament which resulted from her attempt to define the significance of her jug. Here, as there, is a complex situation. To assess it requires a capacity for differentiation. For in this human situation, as in the case of the shattered ornament, the conventional harmony between sign and significance, fact and feeling, has been irrevocably disrupted. The physical facts of the situation do not express its spiritual meaning. Eve's innate rectitude signifies her innocence. As a matter of indisputable fact, however, a stranger has visited her room at night. Ergo Eve is guilty.

In this confusion Frau Marthe obdurately clings to the only tangible reality—her broken jug. She still clings to it in uncomprehending apathy when the full facts have long since come to light. There is only one explanation for this obsession: it reflects that basic limitation of her mind, her inability to grasp anything beyond the immediate physical reality. At the level of reflection, this limitation is revealed in her exclusive concentration on the material properties of her jug and her incomprehension of its spiritual significance. On the practical level, the same limitation finds symbolic expression in her obsession with an isolated piece of material evidence—her jug—and her inability to appraise its true significance in the light of the total situation.

The facts of the night can be explained, it is true. But they cannot be explained away and undone, any more than amends, replacement, or payment of damages for her jug will mend her jug, place it back on its shelf, and undo the damage it has suffered. What has happened has happened and in one sense remains an ugly breach of propriety, even though in another and deeper sense it testifies to Eve's loyalty and pluck. A paradoxical state of things indeed! No less paradoxical than Frau Marthe's jug, which is both a thing of clay and a source of incorruptible life. And as Frau Marthe is unable to perceive the material nature of her jug and yet to believe in its spiritual propen-

sities, so too she is unable to perceive the sordid facts of the night and yet believe in Eve's innocence. For this essential obtuseness the poet could not have found a more appropriate expression than Frau Marthe's dumbfounded silence. It parallels, on the dramatic level, her deep inarticulateness about the jug of which she talks so much and says so little.

Frau Marthe's imperviousness to all but the visible reality is also the shortcoming of the lovers. They too must see in order to believe. With his own eyes Ruprecht has seen Eve in the garden at night with another man. How then is he to believe in her faithfulness?

Sieh da, da ist die Eve noch! sag ich  
 Und schicke freudig Euch, von wo die Ohren  
 Mir Kundschaft brachten, meine Augen nach—  
 —Und schelte sie, da sie mir wiederkommen,  
 Für blind und schicke auf der Stelle sie  
 Zum zweitenmal, sich besser umzusehen. . . .  
 Und schicke sie zum drittenmal und denke,  
 Sie werden, weil sie ihre Pflicht getan,  
 Unwillig los sich aus dem Kopf mir reißen  
 Und sich in einen andern Dienst begeben:  
 Die Eve ist, am Latz erkenn ich sie,  
 Und einer ist noch obendrein. (Scene VII)

It has become a commonplace to say, since Schiller's *Ästhetische Briefe*, that of all the senses the most highly differentiated and most nearly spiritual is the sense of sight. The object we touch or taste is upon us; it overcomes us by its physical proximity. But what we see leaves us free by virtue of the physical distance between eye and object. Unlike the tentacle and the tongue, the eye remains at a distance from its object; it is only our looks that go out to it. And contrary also to the ear, the eye can be averted or shut: of all the senses it is the most active and free, an innate spirituality which has found expression in the twofold meaning of the word "vision." But in describing what passes in the garden, Ruprecht does not speak of sending out his "looks" to the distant scene, but his eyes themselves. As though they were tentacles or hands, he brings his eyes close to their object to touch it and feel it in its tangible reality. And indeed what they disclose to him is the outermost surface of things, to wit, Eve's bib and, later on, the coat tails of his rival: material enough objects, and yet how immaterial in the last analysis! And as Ruprecht makes his eyes perform the offices of material organs, so he thinks of them under the materialistic image of hired servants.

Later on, when he pursues his rival, he is blinded by a handful of sand (Scenes VII and X). This, he admits to Walter, has prevented him from identifying the intruder, an admission of failure which Adam maliciously underscores by asking:

Warum sperrst du nicht die Augen auf?  
 RUPRECHT: Die Augen auf! Ich hatt sie aufgesperrt—  
 Der Satan warf sie mir voll Sand.

To which Adam replies, in a muttered aside: "Voll Sand, ja! / Warum sperrst du deine großen Augen auf!"

The palpable reason for question and comment is, of course, Adam's triumph at having fooled Ruprecht and thus bringing Walter's inquiries to a stop. But his taunt has another function of which the speaker himself is unconscious. By drawing on the imagery of sight, his statement serves to further the development of the central theme of the play. Ruprecht's insistence on seeing, so the poet tells us through Adam's aside, is his undoing, as it is Frau Marthe's. His rigid reliance on his eyes, the way he uses them, and on the material reality they disclose to him, in actual fact makes him blind. Adam can fool him only because he will keep his big and stupid eyes wide open. Had he not tried to see in this confusion but entrusted himself to another sensibility, he would have been spared error and pain. As it is, he experiences both. On coming to from his fall, he sees the humiliation he has caused Eve, and thinks: "Blind ist auch nicht übel. / Ich hätte meine Augen hingegeben, / Knippkugelchen, wer will, damit zu spielen" (Scene VII). These words do not only intimate suffering. They betray a dim awareness of its cause. The comparison of his eyes with marbles, a more material image even than he had used before, by its open contemptuousness implies that Ruprecht has come to doubt the value of perception and of the material reality disclosed by it. And indeed, his final allusion to the incident shows that he has learned his lesson: "Heut streust du keinen Sand mir in die Augen" (Scene XI), he cries as Adam attempts his last deception. From his use of a general figure of speech with its accepted metaphorical significance we may infer that he has understood the deeper meaning of his accident.<sup>9</sup>

It is Eve, however, who most clearly defines the nature of Ruprecht's failure and the response he should have made. Indignantly, she exclaims:

Und hättest du durchs Schlüsselloch mich mit  
Dem Lebrecht aus dem Krüge trinken sehen,  
Du hättest denken sollen: Ev ist brav,  
Es wird sich alles ihr zum Ruhme lösen,  
Und ist im Leben nicht, so ist es jenseits,  
Und wenn wir auferstehen, ist auch ein Tag.  
(Scene IX)

By thus imaginatively accentuating the actual situation, Eve reveals its paradoxical nature. In all essentials, the predicament in which Ruprecht finds himself corresponds to that presented by Frau Marthe's broken jug. For here too, fact and feeling, sign and significance, stand radically opposed. Ruprecht, Eve tells us, should have disregarded

<sup>9</sup> Yet the poet has made it clear that Ruprecht has not solved his problem once and for all. For in the new confusion that arises between Eve and Walter, he mistakes Walter's intentions as readily as he had mistaken Eve's and with undiminished obtuseness clings to the outward facts.

what he saw—whatever that might have been—and believed in what he could not see—in Eve in her deed: an absolute act of faith in an ultimate spiritual reality of which he is as incapable as Frau Marthe. Instead he disregards what he cannot see and believes only in what he sees. This failure of faith, the degradation of spiritual vision to sight and of sight to touch, is the central theme of the play. It is summed up in Ruprecht's reply to Eve: "Was ich mit Händen greife, glaub ich gern."

A realist at heart, Kleist has explored this underlying theme by a variety of techniques corresponding to the variety of his poetic materials. In relation to Frau Marthe, it is stated negatively, by the device of omission. Neither by image nor by concept does the poet designate the deficiency of her response: her imperviousness to all but the visible reality. He merely presents it, by showing her in a number of situations which call for spiritual perception. In leaving her deficiency thus unspoken, he expresses it truly, for even to name a thing is to give it being, and Frau Marthe's lack is absolute. The silence he keeps about Frau Marthe—and for all her loquacity his silence surrounds her throughout the play—in truth is a statement of his theme in its most austere form. As consciousness dawns in his characters, his theme begins to flower into words. It emerges, on the poetic plane, in the images of perception which permeate the texture of Ruprecht's speeches. It is finally evolved as a theme of discourse between Eve and Walter, the most conscious characters in the play.

At the beginning of the *Variant*, Eve is confronted with a seemingly insoluble dilemma: if she refuses to clear her honor, she will sacrifice Ruprecht's love; if she unmasks Adam, she will sacrifice Ruprecht's life. Whatever she does, their happiness is ruined. In this extremity she throws herself at Walter's feet, refusing to get up "als bis Ihr Eure Züge, / Die menschlichen, die Euch vom Antlitz strahlen, / Wahr macht durch eine Tat der Menschlichkeit." To this plea Walter responds thus: "Mein liebenswertes Kind . . . Wenn du mir deine / Unschuldigen bewährst, wie ich nicht zweifle, / Bewähr ich auch dir meine menschlichen." A pledge based, it seems, on the trust in each other's integrity. But Eve has promised more than she can keep. Forced to choose between the elusive goodness of Walter's face and Adam's documented lies, she puts her trust in the latter. Thrice she insists that she has with her own eyes seen the letter containing the fatal instructions:<sup>10</sup> how can she disbelieve their testimony? It is only when Walter bids her see what she ought to have believed that she recognizes the truth: "Du hast mir deines Angesichtes Züge / Bewährt, ich will die meinen dir bewähren; / Müßt ich auf andre Art dir den Beweis / Auch führen, als du mir—" he says, handing her a bag of gold in token of his honesty. "Sieh her, das Antlitz hier des Spanier Königs: / Meinst du, daß dich der König wird betrügen?"

<sup>10</sup> Ed. cit., *Variant*, lines 160, 165, 406.

At this Eve yields. The solid symbol of worth before her eyes does what the fleeting testimony of Walter's features could never achieve. Eve believes in a sign so palpable, so hallowed by time and convention. Overwhelmed, she replies: "Ob Ihr mir Wahrheit gabt? O Scharfgeprägte, / Und Gottes leuchtend Antlitz drauf. O. Himmel! / Daßich nicht solche Münze mehr erkenne!"

This is Eve's final speech. The last word to pass her lips is "erkenne." It bears out what incident and image suggest alike. Eve knows the current coin of truth when she sees it. But at no point does knowledge flower into sheer faith in a spiritual reality unsupported by outward facts and signs. Of her, no less than of Ruprecht and Frau Marthe, the crucial words of the play remain true: "Was ich mit Händen greife, glaub ich gern." At the end this thematic continuity is formally confirmed. Eve's crisis of faith is followed by Frau Marthe's obstinate request that justice be done to her broken jug. A contrast, certainly, but also an ironic parallel, this return to the "zerscherbte Paktum." For the jug is the all-embracing symbol of that obtuse adherence to the physical fact, the visibly real, which informs all characters alike and binds them together in one poetic vision.

And still we have not done with the broken pitcher. Like the true poetic symbol that it is, its meaning seems inexhaustible, and its force pervades beginning, end, and middle of the play. Frau Marthe's pitcher is there all the time, if only we care to see it. For what is the confusing world in which Eve's rectitude comes to grief, but the image on the jug come to life? Netherlanders and Spaniards solemnly united—this is the world betokened by the jug: the picture is shattered, though, and Frau Marthe can no longer comprehend it. As symbols often do in the poetry of Kleist, this symbolic world and the rent that confounds it in the end become real. The commonwealth of nations in which Eve lives is united only in memory. In actual truth, it is as rent as the picture on the jug. Spaniards and Netherlanders are at war, and the latter have turned against each other in strife and exploitation. It is a confusing world. Old signs assume new and ominous significances. The conscription of the militia, in a secure order of things a familiar landmark of life, now betokens sinister designs. This is Adam's account of it, not true, of course, but interesting in the sense of disorientation it reflects,<sup>11</sup> and doubly interesting for the light it throws on the connection between symbol and reality.

Asked whether Ruprecht is likely to be sent farther than Utrecht, Adam replies:

Folgt er einmal der Trommel,  
Die Trommel folgt dem Fähndrich, der dem Hauptmann,  
Der Hauptmann folgt dem Obersten, der folgt

<sup>11</sup> Ruprecht's ready suspicion (*Variant*, line 42) and his statement that the conscription was already once used for foul purposes (*ibid.*, lines 420 ff.) are proof of that.



Dem General, und der folgt den vereinten Staaten wieder,  
 Und die vereinten Staaten, hol's der Henker,  
 Die ziehen in Gedanken weit herum.  
 Die lassen trommeln, daß die Felle platzen.

(*Variant*, lines 128 ff.)

This passage is remarkable for the impression of incongruity it creates. Its logical meaning pulls in one direction, its form and syntax in another. As we learn eventually, it is, in fact, the central government which orders the mobilization of the country and causes the drum to beat. But this comes as a surprise. For by various linguistic means Kleist has created the impression that the drum signals away on its own, mobilizing one by one the military forces that obey its call, until in the last sentence the real motive force is disclosed. Drum and despotic designs, machinery and mover, matter and mind, are dichotomously opposed and held together by the most tenuous of connections. Each pulls its own way and obeys its own law. The signal of the drum, like the signs imprinted on the broken jug, sends out its mechanical message, betokening nothing of ultimate significance;<sup>12</sup> the meaning of the whole has become intractable. Could reality and its pictured image have been presented in a more like fashion?

The broken jug, then, does not merely reflect the failure of the characters to comprehend a complex world. In the last resort, it symbolizes that world itself in which appearance and reality lie promiscuously mingled and in which instinct, untutored by consciousness, is bound to come to grief. The broken pot of earthenware betokens "die Welt noch, die gebrechliche, auf die nur fern die Götter niederschaun," as Kleist has it in *Penthesilea*. Only it is not a world about to be transcended by grace, as in the tragedy, but a world just begun. For the picture imprinted on the jug bears witness of an earlier world where the gods were near and the truth, to be believed, had only to be seen and plucked from trees: a shattered idyll, a paradise lost for ever.

We are back at the beginning: at the conversations of the four young poets about the thematic implications of Debucourt's etching—*innocence perdue*; at Kleist's own assessment of his comedy; and, lastly, at the reflections prompted by the puppet show.

The comedy of Adam and Eve is indeed the comedy of the Fall, the theme of Gessner's and Zschokke's poetic efforts; but in the hands of a Kleist the conception has become immeasurably deepened. He portrays the Fall from that archaic state of grace of which the bear, the puppet, and the plump poise of Tenier's dancing peasants are mute mementos, as is the picture on Frau Marthe's jug: a paradise lost at

<sup>12</sup> Other instances of signs that are senseless are Adam's wig, token of justice; his false letter containing the alleged instructions which, significantly enough, Eve cannot read; and the faked certificate of ill health, appropriately called "der Schein." All this confusion, it is true, is instigated by Adam. But he has not caused the complexity of this world; he merely exploits it. The bewildering world itself is the ultimate poetic metaphor of every one of Kleist's dramatic works.

the first dawning of human consciousness which heralds dissonance and pain. "Solche Mißgriffe sind unvermeidlich," explains the dancer in *Über das Marionettentheater*, "seitdem wir vom Baum der Erkenntnis gegessen haben. Doch das Paradies ist verriegelt und der Cherub hinter uns; wir müssen die Reise um die Welt machen und sehen, ob es vielleicht von hinten irgendwo wieder offen ist."

In Kleist's comedy the gates of paradise are shut. The Fall has taken place. Like his renowned ancestor, Adam yields to temptation and falls,<sup>13</sup> and in his wake fall Eve, Ruprecht, and the pitcher—falls a whole world. But unlike the lovers, the principal comic figures, Adam and Frau Marthe, do not emerge from the twilight of creation into the day of consciousness. It is true, Adam knows good and evil and knows that he has slipped. Yet he denies that knowledge in a concerted attempt to cling to the paradise of unalloyed creature bliss. But deny consciousness as he will, he cannot feign the grace of innocence: his misshapen foot, "der ohnhin schwer den Weg der Sünde wandelt" (Scene I), in the end is his undoing. Thus, heedless of his humanity, yet heavily subject to the law of gravity, he remains a hybrid creature on the threshold of the human world. So too does his counterpart, Frau Marthe. Her primitive poise shattered, she stands before the human scene in sullen incomprehension, like her jug an inert clod bereft of beauty and devoid of sense.

Not until Eve breaks her silence in the *Variant* and gives voice to her inner conflict is the first chapter of the world truly ended. As she accepts the burden of consciousness, the journey around the world begins; she is well on the road to humanity. But from her painful gropings toward knowledge it is a far cry to the effortless beauty of a Raphael, to the unerring poise of an Alkmene, to the unconscious grace of a Prince; a further cry perhaps even than from the spiritual inertia of Frau Marthe and Adam. For grace, says the dancer in *Über das Marionettentheater*, manifests itself most purely where consciousness is nil or infinite, "das heißt in dem Gliedermann oder auch in dem Gott." The gulf between the primordial dimness of the comic hero and the rapturous eclipse of consciousness vouchsafed to the tragic hero is infinite, and the Kleist of 1801 could not span it within the confines of one drama.<sup>14</sup>

It was presumably Kleist's passionate preoccupation with the transcendent grace epitomized by the name of Raphael which led

<sup>13</sup> The various falls are related four times over at great length, once by Frau Marthe, twice by Ruprecht, and once more by Eve. Such emphasis, far in excess of the requirements of the plot, indicates the thematic importance the poet attaches to the event.

<sup>14</sup> To achieve that, he required the technique he was to elaborate later, presenting the two phases of human development in two separate but intersecting spheres, as in *Amphitryon*, or of presenting them in one person, on different levels of one consciousness, as in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. The five acts of that drama, beginning as they do with the sleepwalking unconsciousness of its hero, and ending in his final swoon of fulfillment, do indeed span the history of the world, from its first to its final chapter.



him to venture beyond the dumbness of Frau Marthe's world—Tenier's world—and to pursue his theme into the *Variant*. In doing so, however, he ventured beyond the confines of comedy as he conceived it. For the stuff of Kleist's comedy is unconsciousness, the inability to differentiate, just as the stuff of his tragedies is consciousness, the inability to let go of knowledge and to grasp the unknowable on the wings of faith. Comedy is the prologue to the second chapter of the history of the world, the chapter of human knowledge; its epilogue, tragedy. Its middle pages tell the warmly human story of Eve, which is recorded in the *Variant*.

We would not gladly miss its riches: the flowering of Eve's humanity and the deepening of theme it brings. But undoubtedly it endangers the poetic unity of this play. Eve is too conscious, too articulate, to be comic. For this reason the poet wisely kept her silent during the main part of the drama. On the other hand, she is not conscious and articulate enough to rise to the wounded beauty of an Amphitryon or a Penthesilea, let alone to reach the ultimate grace, at the other end of consciousness, of those Kleistian figures that transcend tragedy: Alkmene, Käthchen, and the Prince. She stands midway in a development, the beginning and end of which give rise to a pure genre. Thus the *Variant* which she dominates, for all its beauty, is a hybrid form. Kleist seems to have been aware of this fact: witness his uncertainty about the ending of the play which is reflected in its different versions. He evidently attempted to integrate the *Variant* with the main body of the comedy, by returning from its heights to Frau Marthe's ludicrous obsession with her jug. This rounding off is formally required and thematically justified. Nevertheless, the transition from Eve's articulate humanity to the twilight of Frau Marthe's world and its hero, a dumb and senseless clod of clay, comes as something of a shock.

Perhaps his faltering steps toward a new genre yet to be developed were as much in the poet's mind as the actual theme of his play, when he wrote to Rühle von Lilienstern in a letter accompanying his comedy: "Es gibt nichts Göttlicheres, als sie [die Kunst]! Und nichts Leichteres zugleich; und doch, warum ist es so schwer? Jede erste Bewegung, alles Unwillkürliche, ist schön; und schief und verschroben Alles, sobald es sich selbst begreift. O der Verstand! der unglückselige Verstand!"<sup>18</sup>

King's College  
University of London

<sup>18</sup> August 31, 1806. *Kleist Briefe*, No. 42.

## PRINCES AND LITERATURE: A THEME OF RENAISSANCE EMBLEM BOOKS

By ROBERT J. CLEMENTS

Even if the Renaissance did not have Marxists to view literature as "heavy artillery," this period of intensifying national consciousness and political maturation did have Machiavelli to demonstrate the political utility of literature—so ably that he is still being used by autarchs in the twentieth century. The Renaissance had as well in its popular emblem books a vast corpus of humanistic thinking, still unexplored in the present century, on the relations between princes or politics and literature. As we shall see, several of these emblem books bore the word prince in their titles, indicating the indirect influence of Machiavelli. Indeed, setting out to record and analyze the thought and prejudice on the princely craft found in the emblematic essays and poems, one might well start with an emblematic assessment of Machiavelli himself.

In his *Icones virorum illustrium*, Boissard held that a reading of Machiavelli would teach the *honnête homme* as much about statecraft in a short time as would steeping oneself for many years in other books on the subject: "Adeo scilicet, ut earum lectione, industrius Lector, qui vir bonus esse velit, ad vitae politicae usum, plus utilitatis, cognitionis, ac experimentiae brevi temporis spacio sibi comparare possit, quam si multos annos in evolvendis libris de republ. ab aliis quibuscunque authoribus scriptis, sese maceraverit."<sup>1</sup> Boissard included a plate portraying Messer Niccolò, with an accompanying distich reading like a Victorian inspirational couplet. Machiavelli teaches governors prudence: "Supremum per te nacta est Prudentia culmen, / Ulterius nec quo progrediatur habet."<sup>2</sup> We have excellent evidence that princes can be taught the recurring lesson of Machiavelli's prudent *Principe* by the medium of the emblem. Guillaume de la Perrière's emblem of the hare (fear) and dog (love) supporting a crown, in his *Théâtre des bons engins* (1539), conveys this lesson:

Prince qui veult que sa vertu fleuronne,  
Et que son bruit soit en tous lieux famé:  
Pour asseurer son sceptre et sa couronne,  
Fault que des siens il soit crainct et amé. . . .<sup>3</sup>

It was frequently pointed out in emblem books that in the past princes and governors have drawn their strength not only from the canton-stone of arms, but also from that of letters.<sup>4</sup> The whole rivalry,

<sup>1</sup> J. J. Boissard, *Icones virorum illustrium* (Frankfurt, 1597-99), III, 324.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 322.

<sup>3</sup> Guillaume de la Perrière, *Le Théâtre des bons engins* (Paris, 1539), Emblème XCII.

<sup>4</sup> Juan de Solorzano, *Emblemata politica* (Madrid, 1653), p. 186.

as well as synthesis, of arms and letters in the Renaissance we have discussed elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> The longest treatment of this topic to be encountered in an emblem book is in the *Emblemata politica* of Juan de Solorzano. An engraving entitled "Armīs et literis" shows the goddess Athene in armor, bearing a lance and shield in one hand and a book and laurel rame in the other. The poetic explication tells us that arms and especially letters contribute values to the state:

Palladis haec Icon una est eademque Minervae,  
Nomina bina duplex munus habere dedit.  
Urbibus imposita est Graiis tutela tuendis,  
Lancea quas firmans, ornat, ut arma, liber:  
Res decus è forti accipiet sic publica magnum,  
Litteris ornatur sed mage pacificis.<sup>6</sup>

The prose amplification of this idea declares that wakeful nights over literature and lucubration over books teach one virtues of knowledge and prudence which are at least as valuable to warfare as is prowess with the sword. There is strength in the toga as well as the military cloak (*sagum*). To show the utility of letters to the state, to demonstrate that letters do not weaken citizens, to prove that princes should know literature, Solorzano cites a long list of authorities from past and present—Horace, Justinian, Laetius, Martianus Capella, Ovid, Synesius, Erasmus, *et al.*, not to mention his fellow emblematists Hadrian Junius, Pierre Coustau, Florentius Schoonhovius, Jacques de Strada, and his compatriot Saavedra Faxardo. The reader will find quoted below in this article (notes 18; 25, 40; 41) the passages in Junius, De Strada, and Saavedra which Solorzano had in mind.

Another passage from Saavedra to which Solorzano may have been alluding is in the *Idea de un Príncipe político christiano (representada en cien empresas)* under the emblem "Non solum armīs." As might be guessed, the *posie* or motto indicates that not only by arms, but also by booklearning, is a commonwealth governed. Keenly interested in statecraft, Saavedra recalls that Alfonso of Naples and Aragon, being asked whether arms or letters were the more important, replied, "En los libros è aprendido las armas, y los derechos de las armas."<sup>7</sup> Thus a sort of primacy is established for books: *cedunt arma literis*.

As if to confirm the claim of his countryman, Juan de Horozco y Covaruvias explained that his uncle, Diego de Covaruvias, became and remained a ruler of Spain not by putting aside his books, but by relying more upon them. Books have as great utility for the state as have arms: "Y por lo menos esten a punto para dar razon de lo que dixeran lo que no se puede hazer sin libros, y mas en nuestra facultad. Y es admirable comparacion la de las armas."<sup>8</sup> The books referred to

<sup>5</sup> R. J. Clements, "Pen and Sword in Renaissance Emblem Literature," *MLQ*, V (1944), 131-41.

<sup>6</sup> Juan de Solorzano, *Emblemata politica*, p. 186.

<sup>7</sup> Diego de Saavedra Faxardo, *Idea de un Príncipe político christiano* (Amsterdam, ed. 1664), pp. 29-30.

<sup>8</sup> Juan de Horozco y Covaruvias, *Emblemas morales* (Segovia, 1591), p. 209.

in this complex prose are not tracts on statecraft, but merely the works which were to be found in a humanist's library.

The fact that such volumes as those in Don Diego's library could not be printed without royal privilege or patent, and on some occasions without the ecclesiastical *nihil obstat*, drew princes necessarily closer to the scrutiny of literature. Even if Rabelais's Third Book carried royal certification that the first two were "no less useful than delectable," these privileges were sometimes difficult to obtain. For example, the Estates-General of Holland in 1617 turned down a request for authorization to print the emblem book *Thronus Cupidinis, sive emblemata amatoria*. In such an atmosphere the emblematisers "played it straight," even to the extent of announcing social utility in the wording of their titles, as did Jean-Baptiste Boudard, Daniel de la Feuille, and Pérez de Herrera.<sup>9</sup> The monarch, too, played it straight. The social and moral utility of the volume was usually specified in the wording of the privilege. Henri II authorizes publication of the emblem book, *Du trésor des antiquitez* "pour le bien commun de nostre République," while the *Emblemas morales* of Horozco y Covaruvias are similarly declared "muy util y provechoso para todos estados de gentes."<sup>10</sup> The author often gave these same assurances in the prefaces, intended for the princes and censors. In the proemium to his *Symbola heroica* Claude Paradin emphasizes that the plates not only delight the reader, but are also useful in pointing up visually the didactic lessons, as indeed kings, generals, and dukes are well aware. "When once they had comprehended the images of pictures and forms of virtue in their lofty minds, they retained them firmly and constantly; the powerful expedient of pictures prevented the moral lessons from evanescing or slipping away."<sup>11</sup> Sometimes the author does not wait until his emblem book's social utility is vouchsafed by kingly approval; rather he pledges his entire project to the edification of the king or prince—a direct petition for approval reminiscent of Voltaire's strategic dedication of *Mahomet*. We shall list several of these volumes *de educatione principis* below.

Any mention of books composed for the edification of the dauphin makes one think immediately of Jesuits. It is not even yet understood to what an extent the Jesuits appropriated emblem books for their purposes. By the seventeenth century emblem literature risked becoming a handmaid not only to theology, but to the Order of the Society of Jesus. When the Jesuits celebrated their first and phenomenal century of growth in 1640, they commemorated the anniversary with a special emblem book, the *Imago primi saeculi Societatis Iesu*. In so far as the Jesuits were heavily engaged in political activity

<sup>9</sup> Jean-Baptiste Boudard, *Iconologie tirée de divers auteurs: Ouvrage utile aux Gens de lettres*, etc.; Daniel de la Feuille, *Livre Nouveau et Utile*; Pérez de Herrera, *Proverbios morales y consejos christianos muy provechosos*.

<sup>10</sup> Jacques de Strada, *Du trésor des antiquitez* (Lyon, 1553), page of authorization; Juan de Horozco y Covaruvias, *Emblemas morales*, ed. cit., n.p.

<sup>11</sup> Claude Paradin, *Symbola heroica* (Antwerp, 1567), preface.

by the early seventeenth century, promoting *un roi, une foi, une loi*, much of their writing for the education of princes had at least a secondary political purpose. The later Quietist Fénelon, whose *Télémaque* was designed to change the ideas of the dauphin from those of his royal father, was Archbishop of Cambrai. That many a volume *de educatione principis* or *ad usum delphini* occurs in emblem literature would indicate an awareness of this principle which guided many Jesuits: indoctrinate the prince, for the child is father of the man. Works of such didactic purpose were the Jesuit Andrés Mendo's *Principe perfecto*, Saavedra Faxardo's *Idea de un Principe político christiano*, and Ambrogio Marliani's *Theatrum politicum in quo quid agendum sit a Principe*. There were, among others, the Augustinian Barenger's *Guide fidèle à la vraie gloire*, written for the instruction of the young Duke of Burgundy, and Giulio Cesare Capaccio's *Principe*, composed not for any young Borgia but for "any lord whatsoever" ("qualunque Signore"). We remember that Henry Peacham presented manuscripts of emblem books to King James and Prince Henry on the theme "*Basilikon Dorion*, his Majesties Instructions to his dearest Sonne Henrie the Prince." These preceptors of princes, being literary men, generally directed their charges, as did Boissard,<sup>12</sup> toward letters and philosophy, just as Aristotle had directed Prince Alexander. Cesare Ripa congratulated Guarnello for seeking to draw out (educate) the minds of princes with poetry.<sup>13</sup>

The emblem books contained a great deal of counsel for kings and princes. An emblem showing three tomes with clasped bindings among the *Empresas morales* (1581) of Juan de Borja makes the point that it is hard for princes to get sound advice given outright and fearlessly. They should therefore depend upon books, "los consejeros muertos," which offer their wisdom, as the posie reads, "sine gratia et sine metu."<sup>14</sup> Indeed, the past teaches Solorzano that it has been the race of learned men who have kept in check the impulses of princes, like the fleet small men of the Tentyritan tribe who govern crocodiles in the rivers by mounting on their backs.<sup>15</sup> The lessons for kings and princes are many and varied. The emblem of the bees over a sepulcher, usually evocative of wasps over the tomb of Archilochus, is utilized in Peacham's second book of the *Basilikon Dorion* (the second and third books actually carry the title *Basilikon Emblematon*) to illustrate flies or wasps over the tomb of Domitian, thus warning that tyrants are killed by their own subjects.<sup>16</sup> Many of the emblems designed to "hold in check the impulses of princes" have an egalitarian message (in the religious rather than purely political sense) or remind the monarch that there exists a power superior to his. Some of the titles

<sup>12</sup> J. J. Boissard, *Icones virorum illustrium*, II, 10.

<sup>13</sup> Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia* (Milan, 1602), p. 216.

<sup>14</sup> Juan de Borja, *Empresas morales* (Praga, 1581), p. 79.

<sup>15</sup> Juan de Solorzano, *Emblemata politica*, p. 193.

<sup>16</sup> Henry Peacham, *Basilikon Emblemata* (MS of ca. 1603-06), Emblem IX.

or posies will illustrate: "In manu Dei cor Regis," "Civium beneficia erga tyrannum frustra," "Aliud plectrum, aliud spectrum," "Roys & pyons dans le sac sont égaux" (a chessical emblem), "Et quae sunt Dei, Deo," and so forth. Zacharias Heyns's emblem, "Tua sorte contentus," shows Diogenes giving a regal Alexander a bit of moral philosophy from the shade of his barrel: "Kost ende kleederen heb-bende, fullen wy ons daer mede laten genoegen." That Diogenes was quoting Scripture (I Timothy 6:8) was, indeed, incidental.

Sometimes, as we have suggested, an important part of the indoctrination was the emphasizing of the utility of literature to the commonwealth. Henry Peacham wrote such a lesson to Queen Elizabeth. An emblem entitled "Quae pondere maior" represents a pen and laurel slightly outweighing a cannon on a scale:

Though Mars defendes the kingdome with his might,  
And braves abroad his foe, in glorious armes,  
Yet wiser Pallas guides his arm aright,  
And best at home preventes all future harmes:  
Then pardon, Sovereigne, if the pen and bay,  
My better part, the other down do wey.<sup>17</sup>

One of these "tutors," Saavedra Faxardo, recommends that monarchs cultivate and encourage brilliant minds and surround themselves, like Justinian, with learned and creative intellects. "Principemque non splendor suae fortunae, non vestes aureae, aut ornatus crinium, & equorum propria pompa, ita honestabit, quantum ipsarum decor litterarum, & fama virtutum."<sup>18</sup> There were many contemporary echoes of this thought in emblem literature. Wither's emblem "Ex utroque Caesar" showed a king holding up a book and sword at equal height: "A Princes most ennobling Parts, / Are Skill in Armes, and Love to Arts."<sup>19</sup> Princes must protect their learned men as well as their poets, wrote Solorzano, just as the apex of a pyramid supports the high-reaching and fruit-bearing vines, a conceit which made an attractive plate.<sup>20</sup> Solorzano quoted Aeneas Silvius' statement "inter Principem illiteratum & marmoream Statuam nihil interesse," and Sansovino's and Camerarius' "illiteratos reges esse quasi asinos coronatos."<sup>21</sup> He praised Vladislaus I of Hungary and Bohemia for holding that men without letters were not complete men and recalled that the Roman soldiery acclaimed Tacitus their Caesar *uno ore*, crying out "Quis melius quam litteratus imperabit?" This ingenuous tableau offers the equally incongruous perspective of Roman legionaries under Fascism hailing their *dux* as the author of *The Cardinal's Mistress*. Jacques de Mesmes wrote that literary patronage dates back to Greek,

<sup>17</sup> Henry Peacham, *Minerva Britannia* (London, 1612), p. 44.

<sup>18</sup> Diego de Saavedra Faxardo, *Idea de un Principe político christiano*, p. 30.

<sup>19</sup> George Wither, *A Collection of Emblems* (London, 1635), Book I, Illustration XXXII.

<sup>20</sup> Juan de Solorzano, *Emblemata politica*, p. 189.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 665, 677.

Hebrew, and Egyptian dynasties.<sup>22</sup> Once in a great while the natural dispositions or impulses of tyrants cannot be mollified by learning or poetry. Ausonius had written, "Neronis indolem non erudiit Seneca, sed armavit saevitiam," a case which Solorzano felt was exceptional.<sup>23</sup> In general the emblematisers were shocked and depressed by this one notable failure of letters to civilize an emperor. In his *Schau-Bühne dess Menschlichen Todts*, Valvasor also stressed the exceptionally vicious and ineducable nature of the tyrant:

Kein Maister der so gerecht /  
 Als Senec war zufinden:  
 Kein Jünger war so schlecht /  
 Wie Nero zu ergründen.<sup>24</sup>

To the Spanish emblemist De Soto, Nero's cruelties to Lucan made him more abhorrent "than the very souls of hell."

In his illustrated biographies of the Roman emperors Jacques de Strada paid special tribute to those wearers of the purple who were generous Maecenases. Worthy of note was Flavius Vespasian, who first instigated the system of paying regular salaries to poets and orators.<sup>25</sup> The emperor Annian Tacitus and the great general Scipio Africanus were Maecenases in the great tradition of Alexander, who offered his favorite Campaspe to Apelles. Not only did Annian Tacitus revere the historiographer Cornelius Tacitus as a father, but he "fit mettre ses livres en toutes les Librairies & à fin que ses œuvres n'allassent à mal, par la nonchalance des lecteurs, il les fit escrire dix fois tous les ans."<sup>26</sup> And Scipio gratefully placed Ennius into his tomb, an event commemorated by a plate in the *Emblemata moralia* of Horozco y Covaruvias.<sup>27</sup> In modern times the Alexandrian tradition was carried on by François I, protector of many philologists and poets. When Boissard thinks on the excessively generous treatment received by Clément Marot at the hands of this Valois king, he makes the ironic comment: "Mirificè enim Princeps literatis delectabatur,"<sup>28</sup> as ironical as Michelangelo's remarks about the handsome treatment of that *enfant gâté*, Sebastiano del Piombo, at the hands of popes and cardinals.

Not only should kings surround themselves with writers, but with emblem writers in particular. In his *Symbola heroica*, Claude Paradin notes that wise monarchs have become interested in the composition of emblem books and even contributed verses and ideas and symbols. For princes know that emblem books are a stimulus to virtue and a

<sup>22</sup> Jacques de Mesmes, *Blasons domestiques* (Paris, 1539), p. 34.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 194.

<sup>24</sup> Johannes Weichardum Valvasor, *Schau-Bühne dess Menschlichen Todts* (Leybach, 1682), II, 138.

<sup>25</sup> Jacques de Strada, *Du trésor des antiquitez*, p. 58.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 188.

<sup>27</sup> Juan de Horozco y Covaruvias, *Emblemata moralia* (Agrigenti, 1601), Book V, Emblem XXXII.

<sup>28</sup> J. J. Boissard, *Icones virorum illustrium*, I, 184.



consolation and comfort in adversity.<sup>20</sup> And as every astute king knew, emblem books like books in general could be a stimulus to loyalty to the crown and were thus deserving of consideration and attention. Had not the popular Horapollo (i, 62) lauded the bee as symbol of a people obedient to their king? A list of rulers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who were the exalted subjects of emblem books would include the following (names of the emblematisers are added parenthetically): Maximilian (Khuen, Stengel), John of Austria (Sambucus), Ferdinand IV (Marx), George of Essen (Iselburg), Felipe IV (Rodríguez de Monforte), Charles II (Ogilby), and Louis XIV (Le Jay, Le Vavas seur, Menestrier).<sup>21</sup> Menestrier, in fact, seems to have devoted most of his life to the glorification of the Sun King. The last triumphs of the *Triumphos morales* (1581) of Francisco de Gómez deal with the exploits of Carlos V and Felipe II in Flanders. This was the age, after all, of the revival of the Pindarism which celebrated kings and heroes. We are reminded of this in Christophorus Giarda's *Icones symbolicae*. "Wars must occasionally be intoned in unequal measures [probably Giarda means the strophe, antistrophe, epode sequence] and praises of princes (*imperatoriae laudes*) must echo to the skies with the heroic majesty of verse. The right hand of Poesy prefers the trumpet which, holy to Mars, is heard at a distance with awesome martial notes, as the bronze of its stops drives heroes and soldiers more vehemently into battle."<sup>21</sup>

A notable example of the emblematiser's serving his prince in a public relations function is Dizain LIII of Maurice Scève's *Délie*, called by Praz "one of the few emblem-books that have real literary value." Much like a modern propagandist, Scève explains away the dishonorable circumstances of the imprisonment and release of François I in Madrid, in what is probably Scève's stylistically poorest and most insincere poem:

L'Architecteur de la Machine ronde,  
Multipliant sa divine puissance,  
Pour enrichir la povreté du Monde  
Créa FRANÇOYS d'admirable prestance:  
Duquel voulant démonstrer la constance,  
Vertu occulte, il l'a soubdain submis  
Aux foibles mains de ses fiers ennemis,

<sup>20</sup> Claude Paradin, *Symbola heroica*, preface.

<sup>21</sup> These emblem books are respectively: Joseph Khuen, *Magnus in ortu, maximus in meridie*, etc.; Georg Stengel, *Gloria bellica Serenissimi et Potentissimi Principis Maximiliani*, etc.; Joannes Sambucus, *Arcus aliquot triumphal*; Joannes Marx, *Doron Basilikon*; Peter Iselburg, *Emblematische Glückwünschung*; Pedro Rodríguez de Monforte, *Descripción de las honras*, etc.; John Ogilby, *Entertainment of his Most Excellent Majestie Charles II*; Gabriel François Le Jay, *Le Triomphe de la religion sous Louis le Grand*; Pierre Le Vavas seur, *Ludovico Magno, Symbola heroica*; Claude François Menestrier, *Histoire du roy Louis le Grand par les médailles, emblèmes, devises*, etc., and other works, including his controversial *La Devise du Roy justifiée*.

<sup>21</sup> Christophorus Giarda, *Icones symbolicae* (Milan, 1628), p. 94.



Chose sans luy vrayement impossible.  
 Puis l'acceptant de ses prouvez amys,  
 L'a remis sus en sa force invincible.<sup>32</sup>

Like the King of France, his English "cousin" could be served by the emblemist's indictment of his enemies. The fable of the wolf and lion setting out to hunt, only to have the lion destroy the wolf, is turned into an anti-papist tract in the *Mirror of Maiestie*:

Ev'n thus when our great *Monarch* clearly saw,  
 How that insatiate *Wolfe* of Rome did draw  
 More riches to his coffers, then deare soules  
 To Heav'n, he like this *Lyon* then controules  
 His usurpation, deeming him a slave,  
 Who more intended to devoure, then save.<sup>33</sup>

In view of such services in the field of public relations, it was natural that kings encouraged emblem writers. By 1623 Tesauro could state that the device had reached its highest point, having been taken up by the academies and "now loved and protected by the authority of the greatest princes."<sup>34</sup> Emblemata were prominent in the libraries of Renaissance rulers, and some of these rulers learned of the art directly from the emblematisers themselves, as James VI of Scotland learned from Théodore de Bèze.<sup>35</sup> Praz tells how Peter the Great had published in Amsterdam a great volume of *Symbola et emblemata* as "a means of introducing his subjects and ex-boyards to the amenities of western civilization."<sup>36</sup>

Not only should kings encourage writers; they should write themselves. Arias Montanus dedicates an emblem of his *Humanae salutis monumenta* (1571) to the proposition that "Mortales homines et re et sermone iuvare, perpetuum magni est principis officium."<sup>37</sup> The attempt to write verse makes one appreciate poetry more. Horozco y Covaruvias remembers that Hadrian composed poems, one of which was placed on the sepulcher of Pompey. "Pudieramos dezir de otros Empereadores que se ocuparon en esta arte a imitación de los Príncipes Griegos, para que se entédiera la estima y precio de los versos."<sup>38</sup> A surprising number of emblematisers voiced the reservation that monarchs should not poetize to excess. Saavedra Faxardo, for example, like Castiglione in the *Libro del cortegiano*, feels that princes should write poetry, since this has kept some of them from oppressing their peoples. But they must not indulge in this avocation at the expense of their vocation. Nor should they even appear to. One must not imitate Nero, who wanted to be an excellent actor instead of an able

<sup>32</sup> Maurice Scève, *Délie* (Paris, 1916), p. 44.

<sup>33</sup> Henry Godyere, *Mirror of Maiestie* (London, 1618), fol. D 2.

<sup>34</sup> Mario Praz, *Studies in Seventeenth Century Imagery* (London, 1939), I, 64.

<sup>35</sup> Henry Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers* (London, 1870), p. 122.

<sup>36</sup> Mario Praz, *op. cit.*, I, 122.

<sup>37</sup> Arias Montanus, *Humanae salutis monumenta* (Antwerp, 1571), n.p., Ode XXV.

<sup>38</sup> Juan de Horozco y Covaruvias, *Emblemas morales*, p. 8°.

emperor, or the King of Aragon, Don Juan I, who wasted so much time rhyming that his vassals rose against him. Moderation is advised. "Pero como es la Poesia familiar en las Cortes y Palacios, y haze cortesanos y apacibles los animos, pareceria el Principe muy ignorante, sino tuviesse algún conocimiento della, y la supiesse tal vez usar. . . . Muy graves Poesias vemos de los que governaron el mundo, y tuvieron el timón de la nave de la Iglesia."<sup>39</sup> Jacques de Strada's *Du thrésor des antiquitez*, with its "effigies of emperors," returns repeatedly to the question of princes and poetry. As he discusses these medallions, he agrees that monarchs must know poetry as part of their preparation and may well practice it, provided that this does not become an addiction. Excellent in "letters and poesy" were Caesar, Gratian, Hadrian, the Gordians, Trajan, and others, not to forget that active Maecenas, Frederic II of Sicily, who translated the *Almagest* of Ptolemy.<sup>40</sup> Junius records that the Emperor Julian was able to divide his time nicely between his humanistic and his governmental duties,<sup>41</sup> or between the plectrum and the scepter, in the words of Covarruvias y Horozco, who, however, held that kings should be connoisseurs although not practitioners of the arts.<sup>42</sup> For monarchs antagonistic to literature De Strada feels only scorn, since letters save us from our baser selves whether we realize it or not. Take the case of the misguided Licinius Licinianus, who "estoit un homme fort aspre, et addonné merueilleusement au péché d'avarice et de luxure: et si ennemi des lettres, à cause de son ignorance, que souventesfois il disoit que c'estoit une poison, et peste d'une république."<sup>43</sup> On the other hand, the Emperor Michael Parapinaceus was as bad as Saavedra's Don Juan I, writing odes under the guidance of the learned Psellus until his neglect of the affairs of state led to his downfall.<sup>44</sup> If the Renaissance did not offer contemporary examples of a Licinius or a Michael, it did have its share of Sunday poets in François I, Henry VIII, and Charles IX. The good poetry composed by François I surprised and pleased Boissard.<sup>45</sup>

Not only was literature in general, then, useful to the state. Emblem books themselves had enhanced utility to the prince and the court. The Renaissance vogue of emblems and devices fitted neatly into the *cortegiano* mode of life. In the first place, many of the devices and plates owed their origins to cavalier heraldry. Giovanni Ferro explained in his *Teatro d'Imprese* that the device was a by-product of knighthood, which was taken over by the academies to be brought to perfection by the men of letters.<sup>46</sup> And Henri Estienne quotes Am-

<sup>39</sup> Diego de Saavedra Faxardo, *Idea de un Principe político christiano* (Valencia, 1675), p. 36.

<sup>40</sup> Jacques de Strada, *Du thrésor des antiquitez*, pp. 140, 363.

<sup>41</sup> Hadrian Junius, *Emblemata* (Antwerp, 1565), p. 75.

<sup>42</sup> Sebastián de Covarruvias y Horozco, *Emblemas morales* (Madrid, 1610), Centuria III, Emblem XVIII.

<sup>43</sup> Jacques de Strada, *Du thrésor des antiquitez*, p. 213.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 342.

<sup>45</sup> J. J. Boissard, *Icones virorum illustrium*, I, 184.

mirato to the effect that "as some define Poetry to be a Philosophy of Philosophers: that is to say, a delightful meditation of the learned: so we may call a Devise the Philosophie of Cavaliers."<sup>47</sup> And in his *Philosophie des images*, Menestrier makes it amply clear that devices and emblems must be cultivated by the *cortegiano*: he associates emblems with "personnes de qualité," "personnes de premier ordre," "personnes d'esprit," including the king himself.

Incidentally, Castiglione, Della Casa, Elyot, Lyly, and Ascham were not the only Renaissance authors busy writing tracts to form the perfect courtier. The emblematicists were also occupied at this endeavor. Berlingiero Gessi's *Spada di honore* is a "first book of chivalrous observations." Three of the most popular courtesy books of the time were the *Miroir politique* of Guillaume de la Perrière (author of the emblematic *Théâtre des bons engins*), *The Compleat Gentleman* of Henry Peacham (author of the emblematic *Minerva Britannica*), and *Civil conversazione* of Guazzo (author of the dialogue on *imprese*). The volume of Gessi is actually an emblem book, containing nine copper plates.

Being so rich in metaphor, emblem literature contributed to the maintenance of ceremonies, pageantry, and traditions of the court and state. Ripa sets as an aim of his *Nova Iconologia*: "per divisare qualsivoglia apparato Nuttiale, Funerale, Trionfale," an aim shared by the emblem books of Lerch, Strunck, and others. Praz's bibliography contains an appendix listing such "emblems and devices for festivities, funerals, degrees, etc."<sup>48</sup> Emblems and devices were selected from these and more conventional emblem books by kings and princes to commemorate themselves, even though Henri Estienne was writing that medals served this purpose better than devices. Well known is the salamander of François I, with the motto "Nutrisco et extinguo," reported by both Estienne and Paradin. Louis XII's emblem of the porcupine shocked Tesauro, who objected in his *Cannocchiale Aristotelico* that a "porc espic" was, after all, a "porc." Several scholars have called attention to the passage in Marlowe's *Edward II*, where the lords describe to the monarch their device for his triumphal pageant. As a final illustration of the extended utility to princes of this symbolism which informed emblem literature, there is the emblematic portrait in Chapman's *Byron's Conspiracy*, where Duke Byron and his horse Pastrana are pictured as symbols of royalty ruling and loyalty serving (II, ii, 77-81):

. . . and they make  
A doctrinal and witty hieroglyphic  
Of a blest kingdom: to express and teach  
Kings to command as they could serve, and subjects  
To serve as if they had power to command.

New York University

<sup>46</sup> Giovanni Ferro, *Teatro d'Imprese* (Venice, 1623), p. 42.

<sup>47</sup> Henri Estienne, *The Art of making Devises* (London, 1646), p. 10.

<sup>48</sup> Mario Praz, *Studies in Seventeenth Century Imagery* (London, 1947), II, 180-201.

## RIVAS' DON ALVARO AND VERDI'S LA FORZA DEL DESTINO

By B. FRANK SEDWICK

To the musician the name Giuseppe Verdi is synonymous with Italian opera. To the Hispanist the name should be significant also, because three of Verdi's best operas (*Il trovatore*, *La forza del destino*, and *Simone Boccanegra*) come directly from Spanish plays, while three more (*Ernani*, *Don Carlos*, and *Alsira*) have Spanish themes. Verdi and his librettist Francesco Piave gave *La forza del destino* its world première in 1862 at what is now Leningrad. This was twenty-seven years after the Duque de Rivas had piqued the literati of Madrid with his *Don Alvaro, o La fuerza del sino*. Then in 1868 Antonio Ghislanzoni revised Piave's libretto of the opera, while Verdi added an overture and two other pieces to the score. Ghislanzoni's only major dramatic change for this now-definitive version was his allowing Alvaro<sup>1</sup> at the end to survive the death of Carlo and Leonora.

Even before his death in 1901, Verdi was a controversial figure. He is generally acknowledged to be a musical genius, but he had a propensity for violent romantic themes and complicated subjects difficult of adaptation to opera. Furthermore, he invariably meddled with the libretto to the extent that his librettists served him as little more than versifiers. If in the United States the great majority of the opera-going public must find its explanation in the English parallel text of either a Ditson or Ricordi libretto, or in one of many popular opera guides, the result can be a Don Alvaro who is more mysterious than he is intended to be.

Among other things, the family background and racial status of Don Alvaro are not clear in either the Italian or the English of the Ditson libretto, which contains parallel English text by Charles Fonteyn Manney. One who has not studied Rivas' play has great difficulty discerning the motives for many of the actions and reactions of Verdi's Don Alvaro. In Rivas, when it is learned that the hero is the offspring of a Spanish viceroy and an Inca princess, who together conspired to found an empire independent of Spain in Peru, one appreciates the hero's extreme sensitivity in all matters touching his racial status. Verdi, however, fails to provide a comprehensive explanation relative to Alvaro's family, past life, or original mission in Spain. This is even more to be lamented in view of the distorted sense in Italian of the intended insult "indiano," aimed repeatedly at Don Alvaro in both play and opera.

According to the dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy, *indiano* and *indio* are distinct terms in Spanish. *Indiano* means (1) "natural, pero no originario de América, o sea de las Indias Occidentales," and

<sup>1</sup> Although it is Alvaro in Spanish, the stress is on the penult in Italian.

(2) "el que vuelve rico de América." The second is the more common interpretation. *Indio* is "natural de la India, o sea de las Indias Occidentales." Two authoritative Italian dictionaries, one of the present age (Petrocchi) and one of the epoch of Verdi (Tommaseo and Bellini), reveal that *indio* has no dictionary status in Italian that has to do with present matters. Although many meanings are listed for *indiano*, the most basic being "gli aborigeni dell'America," it has neither of the two Spanish meanings; that is, English *Indian* and Italian *indiano* are synonymous, but neither has to do with the dictionary meaning of Spanish *indiano*.

Although the Academy dictionary does not allow it, there are cases in both old and modern Spanish literature in which *indiano* has been used to mean *indio*,<sup>2</sup> but, technically, Don Álvaro must be an *indiano* in one of the two dictionary senses, since it is known that he is only half Inca, his father being a Spaniard. He could, however, be called an *indiano*=*indio* through a speaker's ignorance or intended insult in identifying him with the region of (West) Indians. Possibly Verdi thought Alvaro to be 100 per cent Indian. Possibly Verdi rejected periphrasis, and hence clarity in Italian, of the divergent Spanish *indiano* as unpoetic. It is also possible that Rivas' labeling Don Álvaro as *indiano* throughout the play<sup>3</sup> is an example of the rare usage of *indiano* to mean *indio*. If the last is true, then Verdi is partially vindicated, but obviously the problem is obscure in all three languages, and Verdi made no effort to clarify it.

When Verdi omitted all of Rivas' carefully planned initial scene of exposition concerning Álvaro's background, he entered into the narrative with a hero whom the audience or reader has no reason to assume to be different from anybody else in the narrative. As the opera progresses, one comes to understand that Alvaro is some sort of outcast; but it is not until the fifth scene of Act III that Carlo refers to Alvaro as an *indiano*. Then in Scene 8 of Act III and in Scene 3 of Act IV, passages taken directly from the play, Alvaro is again referred to as *indiano*, rendered as *Indian* in the English parallel text, all of this after Alvaro himself had said in the early part of the opera: "E quando il sole, nume dell'India, di mia regale stirpe signore. . . ." The Spanish of this passage was: "Y cuando el nuevo sol en el Oriente, protector de mi estirpe soberana, numen en la región indiana. . . ." Verdi's rendering "región indiana" as "India" is ambiguous, if not

<sup>2</sup> There are many examples, but three should suffice to demonstrate the point. In the poem of Saavedra Guzmán, *El Peregrino Indiano* (Madrid, 1599), Canto XVII, an Indian threatens the Spaniards saying, "Agora aveys de ver nuestra mano / Lo que puede la diestra del indiano." Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda uses *indiano*, -a several times for *indio*, -a in *Guatimozín* (Madrid, 1845). Marcos A. Morínigo points out examples in his *América en el teatro de Lope de Vega* (Buenos Aires, 1946).

<sup>3</sup> On each occasion that Don Álvaro is taunted to fight, first with the Marquis, then with Carlos, and finally with Alfonso, he is taunted by reference to his birth; and both of the Vargas sons call him *indiano* to his face in order to insult him.

mistaken. Italian dictionaries do not admit *India* as referring to the New World or to any part of it, the term for which the plural *Indie* is used, with *India* reserved for connoting the Eurasian region of Hindus, as in English. Even if poetic license could admit it, *India* is so very likely to be misunderstood here that its use does not seem judicious under any circumstances, particularly in view of the operatic Alvaro's indistinctly defined parentage.

The result of all this might have been predicted, for the translator of the Ditson libretto rendered *India* as English *India*: "And when the sun, the God of India, sire of my royal race. . . ." The next step is for such a mistake to appear in the plot summaries of opera guides. In recent works like John T. Howard's *The World's Great Operas*<sup>4</sup> and Oscar Thompson's widely known *International Cyclopaedia of Music and Musicians*,<sup>5</sup> the following statement is to be found: "Don Alvaro, a nobleman from India, is in love with the Marquis' daughter." It probably originated in Leo Melitz's *The Opera-Goers' Complete Guide*.<sup>6</sup> The obvious conclusion is that a number of opera guides summarize their plots from the English parallel texts of librettos and thus not only perpetuate errors which the translator may have made, but also fail to perceive subtleties which often disappear in translation.

Many critics have insisted that the theme of fate, as handled by Rivas, embodies more the adventitiousness of chance. Fate is indeed chance, but necessarily orderly and consistently bad or good chance, whose fabric is seen, which may even be predicted—predictability being what is not essential to chance. It is predictability which is the key to the definition of fate. After the first few extraordinary mishaps, is not Don Álvaro's sequence of misfortunes so diabolically and persistently unfortunate that it can be predicted? And if his mishaps fail to astonish, it is because they have become predictable. Whether the effect was successful or not, Rivas did dedicate all of the first scenes of the play to a genuine artistic attempt to establish from the beginning his desired atmosphere and theme.

Verdi discarded all the necessary initial scenes of exposition in the source work and began his opera with the episode in which the Marquis bids his daughter good night. Here at the outset lies Verdi's chief fault of omission, which contributes to making his hero and his theme less convincing than they were in the play. Perhaps Verdi did not grasp the intricacy of the task; and, musical genius but amateur literary man that he was, he may have reasoned that through his lavish use of the Italian equivalents for the word *fate*, he might restore a measure of the reality and persuasion lost to his plot through considerable abbreviation of the source. Possibly with this and other similar artificialities, Verdi envisioned an end which only mood, and

<sup>4</sup> John T. Howard, *The World's Great Operas* (New York, 1948), p. 132.

<sup>5</sup> Oscar Thompson, *International Cyclopaedia of Music and Musicians* (New York, 1949), p. 2147.

<sup>6</sup> Leo Melitz, *The Opera-Goers' Complete Guide* (New York, 1921), p. 528.



not mere words, can attain.

Yet much of the antipathy which the musical world has shown for the libretto, not the score, of *La forza del destino* can be analyzed as a lack of understanding for a typically and exclusively Spanish subject which nationalities other than Spanish are not well disposed either to appreciate or to comprehend. Although Rivas' play usually is thought to be original, it is only a variation on the "médico de su honra" theme, omnipresent in the literature of Spain since the Middle Ages. However, it seems that, in this case, the sympathies of the author and his audience lie with Don Álvaro, although conservative Spaniards are not lacking to defend the actions of the Marquis and his sons. What none of the critics has considered is the possibility that Rivas aimed at a moral lesson: that the exaggerated Spanish sense of paternal tyranny and family honor ought to be bridled, especially among the decadent nobility. Such obstinate severity on the part of the Marquis brought only disaster to himself, his daughter, his sons, and his would-be son-in-law. It is not to be forgotten that the Duque de Rivas himself was something of a radical and social reformer, for which activities he was forced into exile; and it was while he was in exile in France that *Don Álvaro* was begun.

Note the stage directions to the fifth scene of Act I: "El teatro representa una sala colgada de damasco, con retratos de familia, escudos de armas . . . pero todo deteriorado. . . ." Thus Rivas makes a point of establishing the moribund state of the family fortune, and he is careful to include in the setting the tokens of lineage to which the family clings. On the other hand, Don Álvaro, although rich and generous, is spurned by the Marquis solely on the basis of unknown ancestry. What the Marquis should have been concerned with—whether Don Álvaro was a good Christian—he blindly ignored. The Marquis deserved the punishment which fate inflicted upon him. The critics seldom observe that fate is pursuing the Vargas family as well as Don Álvaro.

Carlos and Alfonso (combined into one, Carlo, by Verdi) are equally deserving of their unhappy end. When Alfonso is dying, he murmurs: "Conozco mi crimen y me arrepiento," an outright admission of guilt on the part of the Vargas family. As for Carlos, not even his fellow officers can speak kindly of him after Álvaro has killed him in Italy. Both in the opera and in the play—Carlo, in Verdi, and Alfonso, in Rivas—commit the forbidden act of striking Don Álvaro, who is wearing the habit of the Church. Rivas surely expends no sympathy on any of the members of the murdered Vargas family, except of course Leonor. Don Álvaro is a victim of the Vargas clan as much as he is a victim of fate.

This, I propose, was Rivas' message. Verdi took the same plot and many of the same lines, but showed no enthusiasm for developing the moral involved in the vendetta aspect of the drama. It is curious how

two salesmen can sell a like product in different ways: to Verdi, the play provided an opportunity to display his patriotic wares. Preziosilla, given a major role by Verdi, is the medium, the same Preciosilla who disappeared after the first scenes in Rivas.

It is well known that Verdi was an ardent patriot and at one time had difficulty in dissuading his friends from their project of forcing him into a political career. Perhaps the fact that the scenes of Rivas' play which have to do with the fighting at Velletri are historical in basis is one of the reasons why the composer was attracted to the play. Verdi obviously does more than is necessary to exalt the cause and valor of those fighting against the Austrians. Preziosilla is his herald who rouses all good Italians to the cause. As she enters the stage for the first time, she shouts, "Viva la guerra." Then with the militant *allegro vivo* aria known as "Al suon del tamburo," she extols the glory of battle against the enemy. No part of this entire scene is to be found in the play, nor does Rivas insert his political sentiments in such a strong manner at any point. Later in the opera, Preziosilla leads another group scene of great animation which ends in a near riot as she chants with chorus the victory song, "Rataplan," in which she accuses the enemy of cowardice.

It is quite necessary that Preziosilla be as vivacious as the pieces which Verdi gave her to sing. The role of Leonora also requires an expert actress and singer, yet smaller opera companies can seldom provide such a performer for what, in actual length of time on stage, is such a small part. Sometimes even the critics of opera fail to do justice to the role of Leonora, exhibiting mistakes not only in the interpretation of the psychology of the role, but also in the description of Leonora's activities and disguises. For example, one opera manual says: "She establishes herself as a hermit, Father Raphael, near a monastery."<sup>7</sup> Actually, Father Raphael is Alvaro's alias, not Leonora's. Another compiler of plots says of Leonora: "She . . . tells her story to the Abbot who shows her a hidden cave in the mountains. There she may live as a hermit, clad in the robe of a nun."<sup>8</sup> What actually happens is that Leonora retires to her refuge disguised as a male recluse, not as a nun. Even the accidental shooting scene is misrepresented, as in Annesley's opera guide: "The father forces Don Alvaro to draw his rapier and in the fight, the Marquis is fatally wounded."<sup>9</sup> A statement like this must prejudice greatly the reader's evaluation of both the hero and the heroine.

Hermano Melitón, called Fra Melitone by Verdi, is one of the most interesting figures of both play and opera, and has been hailed as one of Verdi's most original and remarkable creations. The musical world recognizes the poignancy of Melitone's innocent wit as one of the highlights of the libretto, whereas critics of Spanish literature seldom

<sup>7</sup> Charles Annesley, *The Standard Operaglass* (New York, 1936), p. 812.

<sup>8</sup> Howard, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

<sup>9</sup> Annesley, *op. cit.*, p. 812.



mention more than the fact that he provides comic relief in a work that does need comic relief. Melitón is really the undiscovered gem of Rivas' entire drama, and to credit Verdi with originality here is to overlook the fact that most of Melitón's passages scintillate word for word from Rivas.

The role of Melitón-Melitone, however, is just one aspect of the variety, atmosphere, and action—in general, the bedizenment and vastness of Romanticism—which are the outstanding qualities of both Rivas' *Don Alvaro* and Verdi's *La forza del destino*. Both works still have appeal today, because they offer something for every interest. Their original attraction, however, doubtlessly lay in the fact that, like so many imperfect works of art that have gained currency, both were works of opportunity, products of a period in which the public was well prepared to receive such works. Criticism has been harsh for each, and the predominant feeling is that the opera has lived because of its music and in spite of its libretto. Present investigation has revealed that in the libretto the principal source of confusion is Don Alvaro's parentage and mission, particularly in regard to his being an *indiano*. Many music critics and compilers of opera plots, together with the translator of the Ditson libretto, have increased this confusion through improper interpretations and inaccurate translations, in some cases because of careless or insufficient inquiry. The English-speaking opera-goer is indeed fortunate if he can formulate from the maze any single coherent interpretation of the role of Don Alvaro.

Verdi did not manipulate the theme of fate as well as Rivas, yet it has been the Hispanists who have been most preoccupied in attacking the play on the basis of its supposed factitiousness of theme.

Hispanists have failed to see a moral in the Spanish play, but it is surely there in plain sight. Instead of a moral, Verdi gave his opera a patriotic message by means of a militant Preziosilla in a major role of glorifying war and the defense of Italy. One of the best creations of the play, Melitón, goes almost unnoticed; and, as a result, Verdi receives applause for a creation which is not his, but which he utilized to good advantage.

The role of Don Alvaro is that of a suffering human being, a type for which Verdi exhibited much preference if one recalls other Verdian protagonists of woe and wretchedness, such as the sickly heroine of *La traviata*, the unhappy hunchback of *Rigoletto*, the harassed *Simone Boccanegra*, the pathetic lovers in *Aida*, and other tragic types in some of his less-known operas. It is sometimes overlooked that in this manner Verdian Romanticism provided more true-to-life figures than the stereotyped coquettes and hackneyed cavalieri of pre-Verdian opera. Not artificiality, but impulsiveness (irrationality to the Anglo-Saxon), is the psychology of Don Alvaro as treated by both Rivas and Verdi. The English-speaking critic or opera-goer must appreciate this before he can hope to comprehend Don Alvaro.

*University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee*

## THE IMAGERY OF *MACBETH*, I, vii, 21-28

By ROBERT R. BOYLE, S.J.

The Variorum gives ample testimony of the efforts of critics to explain Macbeth's sonorous lines:

And pity, like a naked new-born babe  
Striding the blast, or heaven's cherubin horsed  
Upon the sightless couriers of the air,  
Shall blow the horrid deed in every eye,  
That tears shall drown the wind. I have no spur  
To prick the sides of my intent, but only  
Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself  
And falls on the other.

There are two problems involved. The first has two aspects: the resemblances between pity and the strange babe and between pity and the active cherubin; and the activity of pity in blowing the deed in every eye until tears drown the wind. The second problem deals with the relationship between Macbeth's motionless intent and his uncontrollable, ill-fated ambition.

Some critics, as the Variorum informs us, have found the first five lines of this passage to be suggestive rather than significative, phantasmagoric, analogous to Michelangelo's frescoes. Cleanth Brooks, with, I think, a better focused critical eye than most writers on the passage, presents a suggestive analysis of this first group of images:

Pity is like the naked babe, the most sensitive and helpless thing; yet, almost as soon as the comparison is announced, the symbol of weakness begins to turn into a symbol of strength; for the babe, though newborn, is pictured as "striding the blast" like an elemental force—like "heaven's cherubim, hors'd / Upon the sightless couriers of the air." We can give an answer to the question put earlier: is Pity like the human and helpless babe, or powerful as the angel that rides the winds? It is both; and it is strong because of its very weakness. The paradox is inherent in the situation itself; and it is the paradox that will destroy the over-brittle rationalism on which Macbeth founds his career.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Brooks states well the comparison of pity to the weakness of the babe. But I must disagree with the supposition that the "cherubin" in this passage operates as a powerful being or as an elemental force. Cherubs of that type are neither found elsewhere in Shakespeare's works nor are they, I believe, operative in this text. Such a notion of cherubs as powerful beings may be verified in the Bible, and in Milton, but not in Shakespeare. When Shakespeare speaks of cherubs, he is invariably thinking of the pink, chubby, winged infants who floated across Renaissance ceilings. In *Cymbeline*, II, iv, 87-88, Shakespeare describes the decorations on the ceiling of the dainty bedchamber,

<sup>1</sup> "The Naked Babe and the Cloak of Manliness," in *The Well Wrought Urn: Studies in the Structure of Poetry* (New York, 1947), p. 45.

"The roof o' the chamber / With golden cherubins is fretted. . . ." An allied passage is that of *Henry VIII*, I, i, 22-23, "Their dwarfish pages were / As cherubines, all gilt."

In *Troilus and Cressida*, III, ii, 74, fears are powerful enough to "make devils of cherubins." In Sonnet 114, the lover's eye is equally powerful in reversing the process: "To make of monsters and things indigest / Such cherubins as your sweet self resemble. . . ."

Cherubs watch over tender loves, as Hamlet ironically implies in his comment on the King's purposes (IV, iii, 47): "I see a cherub that sees them." Cherubs listen to the music of the spheres, as in the *Merchant of Venice*, V, i, 62, where the smallest orb in his motion is "Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubins. . . ." In *Othello*, IV, ii, 63, we hear of "Patience, thou young and rose-lipp'd cherubin. . . ." In *Timon of Athens*, IV, iii, 61-63,

This fell whore of thine  
Hath in her more destruction than thy sword  
For all her cherubin look.

And in *The Tempest*, I, ii, 152-54, Prospero speaks of the helpless infant Miranda,

O, a cherubin  
Thou wast that did preserve me. Thou didst smile,  
Infused with a fortitude from heaven. . . .

In the light of Shakespeare's concept of cherubs ("cherubin" in Shakespeare's usage appears to be a singular rather than a plural form), it seems likely that in the passage from *Macbeth* both the babe and the cherub are by virtue of their helplessness compared to pity, a helpless, passive sort of feeling. Pity of itself produces no powerful results. It merely suffers with another; in its own nature, as pity, it cannot act powerfully to relieve or to avenge another.

The babe and the cherubin, like pity, are not by nature fitted to violent action. If then the babe should spring from its cradle and stride like a powerful man through a great storm (or should straddle, "bestride," the blast as if it were a powerful horse), if the cherub should leap from its feathery cloud onto cyclonic winds blowing across the earth, then we should know that some great and preternatural power had inspired them to act thus against or beyond their natures. Like the infant Miranda, they would be infused with strength beyond the normal. Some cause would be profoundly stirring the very natures of things.

Such a cause would be the murder of Duncan. Such an unnatural deed, upsetting nature, making fair foul and foul fair, would make pity act beyond its nature, like the owl of Act II:

'Tis unnatural,  
Even like the deed that's done. On Tuesday last  
A falcon towering in her pride of place  
Was by a mousing owl hawk'd at and killed.

(II, iv, 10-13)

So horrible a deed, Macbeth warns himself, would make pity, like a striding new-born babe or a tornado-taming cherub, leap to preternatural activity.

Thus the comparison of pity with the babe and the cherub fits into the pattern of unnatural images which occur throughout the play, from the witches' "Fair is foul, and foul is fair," to Macbeth's wish that "The estate o' the world were now undone."

In the final two lines of this first group of images, pity is compared to the winds. Huge windstorms are dispersed by the very rains which they themselves blow up; so the blasts of this preternatural pity will be dispersed by the tears which the pity will cause. In *Troilus and Cressida*, IV, iv, 52, Shakespeare presents the same image: "Where are my tears? rain, to lay this wind, or my heart will be blown up by the root." Macbeth is emphasizing the universal grief which will follow upon the news of Duncan's murder, and states that the national flow of tears will drown the winds of frenzied pity. Macbeth is, be it noted, presenting reasons for not killing the King, among which the national grief, both as a solemn fact and as a source of danger to the murderer, is not the least.

The images in the final lines have occasioned even more discussion than have the babe and the cherub. Some critics, after one penetrating glance, have concluded that the sentence means, "I have no spur, except ambition." So, for example, George Brandes reads the passage: "He pricks the sides of his intent, as he says, with the spur of ambition, well knowing that it will o'erleap itself and fall."<sup>2</sup> But why should even an undesirable spur cause a horse to overleap and fall? The soldier Macbeth, to whom this cavalry imagery comes naturally, would also know that it is not the spur but the way the spur is used that determines the effect. It is at least odd to qualify a spur with the adjective "vaulting." And "which" seems quite clearly to refer to ambition, not to intent.

Some editors brush aside the difficulty with a cryptic note similar to this one of E. K. Chambers: "*the other*, i.e. the other side. Some critics would put *side* in the text. It is not necessary. The pause fills up the syllable; and the sense is supplied from 'the sides of my intent.'"<sup>3</sup> How the sense is supplied from "the sides of my intent" is not immediately obvious. I suppose these editors have in mind Malone's solution, that ambition is a rider attempting to vault into his saddle. Thus the sides which the rider could not spur when he was on the horse are, they would say, the same sides meant in describing the unmounted man's unsuccessful leap. Malone's idea appears to be the one adopted by most editors and students. Caroline Spurgeon, for example, describes the passage as "the vision of his 'intent,' his aim, as a horse lacking sufficient spur to action, which

<sup>2</sup> William Shakespeare (New York, 1924), p. 422.

<sup>3</sup> *Tragedy of Macbeth* (New York, 1915), p. 104.

melts into the picture of his ambition as a rider vaulting into the saddle with such energy that it 'o'erleaps itself,' and falls on the further side."<sup>4</sup>

Malone's reading is better than Brandes', since Malone's does take into account the grammatical relations and the significance of the sentence. But Malone's reading results in a clumsy juxtaposition of poorly related images, which should not be imposed upon Shakespeare if some better solution is available. Malone presents two pictures: Macbeth on the horse Intent, unable to make it go except by means of ambition; Ambition as a rider who vaults over his horse in his eagerness to get on. Yet in Shakespeare's sentence both "spur" and "vaulting ambition" are objects of the same verb; they should both belong to Macbeth.

Howard Staunton saw that Malone, in picturing Macbeth lacking a spur and possessing a rider unable to mount a horse, had solved a difficulty by ignoring the problem. Of Malone's reading Staunton says,

This does not assist us much; still less does the fanciful suggestion to read for "itself" its sell, i.e. its saddle. The only resolution of the enigma which presents itself to our mind is to suppose *Intent* and *Ambition* are represented in Macbeth's disordered imagination by two steeds, the one lacking all incentive to motion, the other so impulsive that it overreaches itself and falls on its companion.<sup>5</sup>

Staunton faces the problem courageously. He vastly improves Malone's reading by making "intent" and "ambition" the logical objects of "have." But while his solution, unlike Malone's, is built on the text of Shakespeare, it does not solve very much. Macbeth's imagination would have to be disordered to yoke together so inharmonious a team, one refusing to move and the other, even though yoked, nevertheless vaulting, going too far (!), and falling on his stubborn companion. Furthermore, why should Intent refuse to move, when Ambition is so anxious?

All of these writers suppose that by "my intent" Macbeth means his intent to kill the King. My contention is that at this point in the play Macbeth has no such intent. In this soliloquy Macbeth is giving himself motives for being good, for doing the right thing. He has been torn two ways ever since he heard the prophecy, "All hail, Macbeth, that shall be king hereafter!" He started and seemed to fear—did fear, in fact—not the "royal hope" but fantastical murder. He was so drawn to that horrible act, drawn by what lay beyond it, that his hair moved and his seated heart knocked at his ribs against the use of nature. His ambition leaped toward murder and beyond. He needed no spur to vault over the obstacle to the kingship; the spur was needed in order to move in the opposite direction toward loyalty and honor.

Lady Macbeth knows her husband well. She predicts his reaction:

<sup>4</sup> *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us* (New York, 1935), p. 334.

<sup>5</sup> *Plays of Shakespeare* (London, 1860), III, 480.

Glamis thou art, and Cawdor, and shalt be  
 What thou art promised: yet do I fear thy nature;  
 It is too full o' the milk of human kindness  
 To catch the nearest way. . . . (I, v, 13-16)

She realizes that, left to himself, he may obey the promptings of his noble nature, and turn in horror from the act of murder in spite of his ambition. She wants him, therefore, to

Hie thee hither,  
 That I may pour my spirits in thine ear,  
 And chastise with the valour of my tongue  
 All that impedes thee from the golden round. . . .  
 (I, v, 23-26)

Macbeth, in Scene iv, was profoundly moved toward murder by the dignity of Malcolm. But it is his desires, not his intent as yet, which he seeks to hide. In this connection, it may be pertinent to recall that Shakespeare drew his character Macbeth from two sources in Holinshed.<sup>6</sup> The material for Scene iv comes from Macbeth's reaction to Duncan's appointment of Malcolm as his successor: "Mackbeth sore troubled herewith, for that he saw by this means his hope sore hindered . . . he began to take counsell how he might vsurpe the kingdome by force . . ." (p. 364). But the Macbeth of Scene vii is drawn from Donwald's story, about which Holinshed says: "Then Donwald, though he abhorred the act greatlie in his heart, yet through instigation of his wife, hee called foure of his seruants vnto him . . ." (p. 358). Shakespeare may not have been too much concerned about the absolute consistency of his character in the two scenes. Shakespeare's Macbeth combines the ruthless ambition of Holinshed's Macbeth with the good but ineffective abhorrence of Donwald.

In any case, in the soliloquy we are considering, Macbeth gives himself the strongest reasons he can summon up for spurring away from the murder. He will suffer if he does it, he tells himself, not only in the world to come, but—and he implies that this expedient reason will more effectively move his intent to good—even in the present world. Duncan is his king and his guest; further, Duncan is a most admirable man.

And then Macbeth, the brave soldier sorely tempted, says almost in despair, "I have no spur / To prick the sides of my intent. . . ." His intent, to be a loyal subject, a good host, and an honorable man, is a horse which he cannot urge into movement. None of the arguments he has presented to himself has served as a spur to goad the intent which he has mounted. He does not want to ride the other horse, which there is no need to spur, "Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself / And falls on the other." The intent would carry him safely, as he knows. His intent to do good, the aim of the arguments in his solil-

<sup>6</sup> Quotations from Holinshed are from the Shakespeare Variorum, and the page references are to the 1898 edition.

oquy, is opposed to his riding of ambition. Unlike the trustworthy intent, "vaulting" ambition is worthy of a good soldier's contempt. It is not a competent, reliable animal. It will leap over the obstacle, but will outdo itself, leap too far, and fall on the other side. That is to say, Macbeth would by murder become king, but he would be also a murderer, subject even in this life to detection, to rebellion, to retribution. Macbeth implied earlier in his argument that if present danger did not threaten, he would ride ambition willingly, and let the jump over the life to come take care of itself. But since he will have to jump over an obstacle into unknown danger even in this life, and that on a beast as likely to fall as it is willing to vault, he tries to get his reliable intent to move and carry him away from such dangers.

Shakespeare often anticipates a significant image in a previous part of his play. For example, Malcolm's "Macbeth is ripe for shaking" of Act IV foreshadows Macbeth's "My life is in the sear, the yellow leaf." Duncan, in Scene vi of Act I, anticipates the horses of the following soliloquy:

he rides well  
And his great love, sharp as his spur, hath holp him  
To his home before us. (22-24)

Duncan pictures Macbeth riding to loyal and devoted service on his manly intent, with the adequate spur of loyal love. That is precisely the spur that Macbeth in the next scene finds that he lacks.

It seems to me that the psychic state of Macbeth in Scene vii prepares the way for "Tarquin's ravishing strides" of the following scene. Hunter, in his commentary on "Tarquins ravishing sides" in the *Variorum*, says,

Tarquin seems to have haunted the imagination of Sh[akespeare] from his early days, when he chose the rape of Lucretia as the subject of a poem. He appears in the plays several times, and often unexpectedly, and certainly never less propitiously than here, whether we read *strides* or *sides*. (p. 93)

Not so unpropitiously, if we perceive that in the previous scene Macbeth, with his motionless intent and his vaulting ambition, appears in the same state that Tarquin was in before his crime:

Thus graceless holds he disputation  
Twene frozen conscience and hot burning will. . . .  
(*Lucrece*, Stanza 36)

The final lines of Macbeth's soliloquy, then, as I read them, might be paraphrased thus:

If this horrible deed is committed, it will cause such an upset in the natures of things that even pity, which is normally like a newborn babe or a cherub, will be as different from its usual self as the babe would be if it strode through a great storm (or bestrode a blast as if it were a horse), or as the cherub would be if it rode the invisible winds. Therefore pity, inspired by this unnatural deed, will blow the deed in the eyes of all Scots, so that the tears of universal grief will give relief from the winds of passionate pity.



But alas! nothing I can present to myself of the horrible nature and consequences of this deed moves me to resolve not to do it. My intent to be a loyal man is not enforced by effective resolves. I have no spur, no motive, that will make this horse go.

My whole desire is against my intent to do good. I burn to achieve the kingship, even though I must murder the king to do it. And that act of murder would ruin me. This is the horse that is all ready to go with no need of a spur, my ambition, which will get me to the kingship by vaulting over the obstacle of Duncan. But that obstacle is too high, ambition is too eager. She will not carry me safely down the course, but will fall on the other side of the obstacle and crush me.

*St. Louis University*

## COWPER AND THE POLYGAMOUS PARSON

By LODWICK HARTLEY

One of the most recent critical treatments of William Cowper contains the following statement: "When Cowper turned to poetry after the departure of Newton [from Olney] it was to Mrs. Unwin that he looked for a subject, and the one she suggested was *The Progress of Error*"; moreover, essentially the same idea is echoed by the latest biographer.<sup>1</sup> It would thus appear that the habit of crediting Mrs. Unwin with giving Cowper the principal impetus for the satirical poems published in 1782 (a habit dating at least as early as Hayley's biography of 1803) is persistent. Although one may not want to follow Saintsbury in allowing to the devoted Mary the capacity for instilling only a grudging minimum of poetic inspiration,<sup>2</sup> one may certainly argue that her importance in this particular instance has too often been exaggerated. In fact, only a reading of Cowper's letters between February, 1780, and April, 1781, should be necessary to convince anyone that the poet turned from the painting of mountains and dabchicks—a hobby that he had acquired in addition to carpentry and gardening—to the writing of verse on a larger scale than he had ever before attempted, not because of any delicate prodding by his companion, but because of a tempest in the Evangelical teapot involving his cousin, the Reverend Martin Madan, and his friend, John Newton, whose removal to London had by no means displaced him as an important influence.

The significance of Cowper's verse satire *Anti-Thelyphthora* in providing a starting point for the 1782 volume has been suggested both by Thomas Wright and by Hugh I'A. Fausset. But Lord David Cecil essentially ignores it, and Gilbert Thomas and Maurice Quinlan do not develop the important circumstances surrounding the poem's inception. A restatement and a further elaboration of what the letters suggest about Cowper's interest in the controversy that produced the satire ought, therefore, not to be lacking in pertinence at this time.

On May 31, 1780, Madan published his well-intentioned but ill-advised book, *Thelyphthora, or a Treatise on Female Ruin*.<sup>3</sup> The book, as almost every student of the eighteenth century now knows, was an argument for polygamy based on a literal interpretation of the Pentateuch and designed to offer a solution for the problem of the fallen woman which Madan, as chaplain of the Lock Hospital, felt to be a critical one. Though the actual publication of this fantastic work exploded with considerable noise, the book did not come entirely as a

<sup>1</sup> Norman Nicholson, *William Cowper* (London, 1951), p. 45; and Maurice Quinlan, *William Cowper: A Critical Life* (Minneapolis, 1953), pp. 105-106.

<sup>2</sup> See George Saintsbury, *Peace of the Augustans* (London, 1916), pp. 334-35.

<sup>3</sup> Two volumes appeared at this time. A third volume appeared in 1781.

surprise. Many people, including Newton, had known about its impending publication, and Newton had personally tried to dissuade Madan from his folly. Through Newton, Cowper had been fully advised of the affair at least as early as February, 1780.<sup>4</sup>

As Wright and Fausset have pointed out, Cowper's attitude was at first that of detached amusement—an attitude that later grew into righteous indignation and almost into a minor obsession. That this development was largely determined by Newton's own interest in the matter is evident. Otherwise, there would have been little reason for Cowper to turn so sharply as he did on the cousin who had stood by him in London during his trying experience of 1763.<sup>5</sup>

Six days after the actual appearance of *Thelyphthora* (that is, on June 5, 1780), Cowper enclosed in a letter to Newton a little poem entitled *Anti-thelyphthora* (later renamed "The Doves") with an opening stanza afterward suppressed:

Muse, mark the much lamented day  
When like a tempest fear'd,  
Forth issuing on the last of May  
Thelyphthora appear'd.<sup>6</sup>

The whole poem was obviously intended to please the Newtons; and in a charming postscript to a poem about how the mating of doves argues against the wisdom of men who argue for polygamy, Cowper points out his former neighbors in Olney as human prototypes of Evangelical marital felicity. He thus suggests a nexus between his emotional involvement with the Newtons and his ultimate emotional involvement in the controversy.

Newton, of course, could not regard the matter of the book with such delicate detachment as Cowper had done. After all, his advice had been spurned, and the horror had come to pass. Therefore, the redoubtable clergyman sought to engage Cowper in a reasoned attack on *Thelyphthora*: something that would be far more significant than a light thrust from a poetic trifle like the poem Cowper had already proffered. Cowper's rejection of Newton's advice is as important for what it says between the lines as for what it says on the surface:

If I had strength of mind [he wrote on July 12], I have not strength of body for the task which, you say, some would impose upon me. I cannot bear much thinking. The meshes of that fine network, the brain, are composed of such mere spinners' threads in me, that when a long thought finds its way into them, it buzzes, and twangs, and bustles about at such a rate as seems to threaten the whole contexture.—No—I must needs refer it again to you.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Wright, *Correspondence of William Cowper* (London, 1904), I, 172-73.

<sup>5</sup> Actually, Cowper's opinions on the book had to be second-hand, for he did not see the book until the middle of April, 1781. Then he read only a part of it. Cf. Bernard Martin, *John Newton* (London, 1950), pp. 288-91. Mr. Martin's treatment of the entire incident is muddled.

<sup>6</sup> Wright, *Correspondence*, I, 195.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 215.

Obviously, it was not easy for Cowper to turn Newton down. And from the nature of the rejection, one gathers that Cowper consciously or subconsciously retained the feeling that he really ought to have complied.

But whatever conviction of having failed his friend that Cowper might have had was happily dispelled by the October issue of the *Monthly Review*, which contained a refutation of *Thelyphthora* by Samuel Badcock, a well-known theological and literary critic. Shortly after the review appeared, Cowper wrote to William Unwin:

I am informed that *Thelyphthora* is at last encountered by a writer of abilities equal to the task. An answer to that base-born book was a grand desideratum in the world of literature. I call it so because it is the spurious issue of Scripture violated by misinterpretation. The mother is ashamed of the brat, and disowns it in every page; but the father (a father is sometimes proud of his bastard) dandles it upon his knee, and holds it up to the admiration of all beholders. This champion for the rights and honours of single marriage comes forth in the *Monthly Review*: I have not yet seen the first specimen of his performance, which belongs to October, but have ordered it down from London. . . . It is high time this false light should be extinguished. . . . You will think perhaps I talk big for one that has never read it: but I am acquainted with the principal hinges on which the whole depends, and am persuaded that one flash of truth would melt them. Mr. Riland of Birmingham sent into this country a string of twenty-seven printed queries, unanswerable he thinks, unless in such a way as must unavoidably induce a necessity of adopting Mr. Madan's plan. But being persuaded that even I was a match for such an enemy, I ventured upon the formidable task, and gave them twenty-seven answers.<sup>8</sup>

Cowper's feeling of release and the attendant buoyancy and confidence of his spirits are apparent. The phrase "the spurious issue of Scripture violated by misinterpretation" suggests the germ of *Anti-Thelyphthora*; and the whole background of an attack on theological error can be seen to be taking shape. The postscript suggests that Cowper was now prepared to move into the arena not with a theological disquisition, which he abhorred, but with verse satire upon which he was willing to try his spurs: "I have read the Review; it is learned and wise, / Clean, candid, and witty,—*Thelyphthora* dies." The way now was paved for *Anti-Thelyphthora* and *The Progress of Error*.<sup>9</sup>

Exactly when Cowper began writing his satirical attack on Madan's book is not clear. But by the third week in December the little poem was almost ready to come from the press. The steps in the actual publication are simple to follow: Cowper wrote the poem and sent it to Newton, who substantially approved the work and then quietly

<sup>8</sup> This letter is found in Wright among the Letters of 1786 (III, 81-84). Southey so placed it, but he made a note to correct the error in the analytical table of contents (see *Works of William Cowper* [London, 1854], III, xii, 344-46). Wright apparently failed to see the note.

<sup>9</sup> In December he published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* the quatrain beginning "If John marries Mary." John and Mary are, of course, John and Mary (Catlett) Newton. See *Poetical Works of William Cowper*, ed. H. S. Milford (London, 1934), p. 629. See also Wright, *Correspondence*, I, 395.

took it to his own publisher, Joseph Johnson in St. Paul's Churchyard, for anonymous publication. It was all in the best, or worst, tradition of the anonymous satirical attack. Though Cowper was later ashamed of his action, it must have provided sufficient excitement at the time.

In a letter to Newton on December 21, Cowper plainly assigns the awakening of his poetic impulse, and thus the inception of *The Progress of Error*, to what had gone on between the two friends in regard to *Anti-Thelyphthora*:

I annex a long thought in verse for your perusal. It was produced about last midsummer, but I never could prevail with myself till now to transcribe it. *You have bestowed some commendations on a certain poem now in the press, and they, I suppose, have at least animated me to the task.* . . . I am pleased with commendation, and though not passionately desirous of indiscriminate praise, or what is generally called popularity, yet when a judicious friend claps me on the back, I own I find it an encouragement.<sup>10</sup>

In the same letter, Cowper mentions that *The Progress of Error* and *Truth* are under way. A deprecation of the fact that *Anti-Thelyphthora* was not so serious-minded an attack on the basic moral issues involved as it should have been is seen in the conclusion to the letter: "Don't be alarmed. I ride Pegasus with a curb. He will never run away with me again. I have even convinced Mrs. Unwin that I can manage him, and make him stop when I please." It is pleasantly ironical that Cowper was destined in a short time to ride to wide popular fame on another runaway horse—one that John Gilpin had borrowed and one on which Mrs. Unwin had no lien. But the poet was now concerned with demonstrating to Newton, and to whomever else he might, that he was capable of a serious didactic purpose.

Since the January issue of the *Critical Review* carried a short review of *Anti-Thelyphthora*, the slender quarto pamphlet must have come out late in December, even though its title page is dated 1781. In allegorical form it tells how Sir Marmadan (Badcock) put an end to the shameful liaison of Sir Airy del Castro (Madan) and Dame Hypothesis. The allegory which owed something to Spenser, something to Pope, and something to the whole mock-heroic tradition was, in the words of the *Critical Review*, "supported with a tolerable spirit of poetry."<sup>11</sup>

Shortly after the middle of February, Newton had read the manuscript of *The Progress of Error* and had approved with one exception. The original form of the satire contained a direct attack on Madan beginning with "Curs'd Thelyphthora, &c." Newton had objected to this passage apparently not because it attacked Madan, but because it contained an "obnoxious" word. (The word "curs'd," says Wright, shocked him by reminding him of his early swearing!)<sup>12</sup> Cowper

<sup>10</sup> Wright, *Correspondence*, I, 248-49. The italics are mine.

<sup>11</sup> *Critical Review*, LI (January, 1781), 74.

<sup>12</sup> See Wright, *Correspondence*, I, 270. Quinlan's idea (p. 110) that Newton objected to something "salacious" in the poem seems to be in error.

first changed the word to "abhorrd" and then removed the whole passage, engrafting "a new scion" into the poem: namely, the attack on Chesterfield, who—unlike Madan—was safely dead. But even with the removal of the lines, the poem still carried indirect references to Madan that were plain enough. As anyone could see, the plan of the poem involved showing how error, beginning in the cult of pleasure, progresses to the error of scriptural exegesis and, concurrently, how error proceeds from the clergy to the flock. Even in its revised form, the real focus of the poem is determined by the implied attack on Madan.<sup>13</sup>

The rest of the account (from which many interesting ramifications have already been omitted) involves among other things the delightful little review of *Anti-Thelyphthora* in the March issue of the *Monthly Review*<sup>14</sup> and the open quarrel between Newton and Madan, which Cowper commemorated in a bit of doggerel.<sup>15</sup> Though all these details are a part of an entertaining story, narrating them is beyond the purpose of this discussion. It is only necessary to establish the direct connection between *Anti-Thelyphthora* and *The Progress of Error* to establish the connection between the attack upon Madan and the whole volume of 1782; for Cowper's mind worked on the principle of association of ideas clearly demonstrated in every long poem that he wrote and delightfully immortalized in *The Task*. But whatever the connection between the Madan controversy and the rest of the poems of the 1782 volume may be, it ought at least to be plain that nothing so simple as a suggestion from Mrs. Unwin was the genesis of *The Progress of Error*.

North Carolina State College

<sup>13</sup> See especially *The Progress of Error*, lines 431-510.

<sup>14</sup> *Monthly Review*, LXIV (March, 1781), 229-30.

<sup>15</sup> *Poetical Works*, p. 629. Cowper again established a friendly relationship with Madan at least by June 8, 1789, when Cowper wrote to thank his cousin for a copy of Madan's *A New and Literal Translation of Juvenal and Persius*. See letter of that date in *Spectator*, CXXII (March 22, 1919), 361. The original is in the Haverford College Library.

## NOTES AND QUERIES CONCERNING THE REVISIONS IN *FINNEGANS WAKE*

By THEODORE B. DOLMATCH

"Anna Livia Plurabelle," where, according to Padraic Colum, "James Joyce's inventions and discoveries as an innovator in literary form are more beautifully shown . . . than in any other part of his work,"<sup>1</sup> was developed earlier than any other portion of *Finnegans Wake*. This twenty-page fragment epitomizes the entire volume, and an examination of the alterations made in this section may, therefore, illuminate both the meaning of the work and Joyce's method. On the basis of excerpts taken from the different texts of "Anna Livia Plurabelle," I shall try to suggest certain questions about the work as a whole which should be answered when an evaluation of *Finnegans Wake* is made.<sup>2</sup>

The pages of "Anna Livia Plurabelle," said Joyce, "have cost me sixteen hundred hours of my life."<sup>3</sup> They make up the last portion of the "Book of Life," the first part of *Finnegans Wake*. In them are the story of a young girl, a description of a river's course to the sea, a glorification of things female, and a punning torrent of more than five hundred names of rivers. All of this and more are included in the conversation of the two washerwomen, themselves symbols of "elemental forces."<sup>4</sup> They work opposite each other on the banks of the Liffey, and while they talk of past scandals and repeat familiar folklore, night gradually comes to the city. As they call to one another, the river widens; the sounds of evening are heard, and the women are transformed into a stone and a tree "beside the rivering waters of, hitherandthithering waters of. Night!"

James Joyce began his last work in 1922, shortly after the publication of *Ulysses*. Fragments were published in the *transatlantic review* in 1924, and "Anna Livia Plurabelle," called simply "From Work in Progress," first reached the public in *Le Navire d'Argent* in 1925.

<sup>1</sup> Padraic Colum, preface to *Anna Livia Plurabelle* (New York: Crosby Gaige, 1928), p. vii.

<sup>2</sup> The different texts of "Anna Livia Plurabelle" appeared in *Le Navire d'Argent*, II (1925), 59-74; *transition*, No. 8 (1927), pp. 17-35; *Work in Progress, Volume I* (New York: Donald Friede, 1928); *Anna Livia Plurabelle* (New York: Crosby Gaige, 1928); *Anna Livia Plurabelle: Fragment of Work in Progress* (London: Faber and Faber, 1930 [Criterion Miscellany, No. 15]). The final version appears in *Finnegans Wake* (London: Faber and Faber, and New York: Viking, 1939). The errata sheet, *Corrections of Misprints in Finnegans Wake*, was published by Faber and Faber and Viking in 1945. A phonographic recording of Joyce's reading of a section of this work is *James Joyce Reading "Anna Livia Plurabelle"* (Cambridge: Orthological Institute, n.d.).

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Louis Gillet, "Mr. James Joyce and his New Novel," *transition*, No. 21 (1932), p. 271.

<sup>4</sup> William Troy, "Notes on *Finnegans Wake*," in Seon Givens, ed., *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism* (New York, 1948), p. 314.



The final title of the complete work was not divulged until 1939, when *Finnegans Wake* was published. In 1927, *transition* began the serial publication of the entire *Work*; and a revised "Anna Livia Plurabelle" appeared in this magazine in October. The published text was altered once more before 1928, and a large portion of the completed work was reprinted by Friede, in New York, as *Work in Progress, Volume I and Part 13*, for copyright purposes. A limited edition of "Anna Livia Plurabelle," essentially as it appears in the final version, was published by Crosby Gaige in the same year. This text, with minor typographical variations, was issued in a trade edition in 1930 by Faber and Faber.<sup>5</sup> In 1939 the complete *Finnegans Wake* was published. But Joyce still was not finished. He made some alterations while reading the text for a phonographic recording, and in 1945 the publishers produced *Corrections of Misprints in Finnegans Wake* for purchasers of the original edition. This was an errata sheet compiled by the author shortly before his death in 1941; he was looking forward to a second edition.<sup>6</sup>

Thus the first available copy of the text is that in *Le Navire d'Argent*. The next version, in *transition*, contains more changes than appear in the third reworking, that printed by Friede, Crosby Gaige, and Faber and Faber. This 1930 issue might be considered the last text available, for *Finnegans Wake* shows few further alterations, as do the 1945 errata and the recording.

The prose which appeared in *Le Navire d'Argent* is not more complicated than that in the last section of *Ulysses*, but it becomes more difficult as the revisions are made. The conversation of the women is punctuated to indicate the speaker; therefore, in one sense the pattern of the prose is more comprehensible than Molly Bloom's one-sentence daydream. The women are garrulous, and the intellectual level of their conversation is not high, but within this dialogue, reducible to Basic English,<sup>7</sup> there are all the complexities of Vico's theory of flux and reflux of history, Jung's collective unconscious, and Einstein's theory of relativity. But the implications of the change of "O, my

<sup>5</sup> Joyce wrote concerning this edition:

Buy a book in brown paper  
From Faber and Faber  
To hear Annie Liffie trip, tumble and caper.  
Sevensinns in her singthings,  
Plurabells on her prose,  
Sheashell ebb music wayriver she flows. . . .

This is an excellent introduction to the language of *Finnegans Wake*. It first appeared in *transition*, No. 21 (1932), p. 258.

<sup>6</sup> For much of this information regarding editions I am indebted to Alan Parker, *James Joyce: A Bibliography of His Writings, Critical Method, and Miscellanea* (Boston, 1948), pp. 62 ff.

<sup>7</sup> C. K. Ogden, with the assistance of Joyce, prepared a Basic English version of the last four pages of this episode. It appeared in *transition*, No. 21 (1932), pp. 259-62. There are translations of portions of the work into French, German, and Italian. The difficulties in translating the work into French are described by Phillipe Soupault, *Souvenirs de James Joyce* (Paris, 1945).

back, my back, my back!" the eternal cry of washerwomen, to the final "Oh, my back, my back, my bach!" do not seem significant as variations on any of the themes mentioned above. The same might be said of "I hurd thum sigh," which is "I heard them say" in the first two versions.

Punning is an acceptable literary device, but the wit of "shampain" as a new word for a morning-after headache is subliterate. "Forst-felfoss" is no better. This is the verb invented to describe the falling of a tree across a stream; as it lies in the water, it creates a waterfall. *Forst* is a combination of "first" and "forest," with the further implications of "force"; *foss* is a Scandinavian word for waterfall. The three *f*'s remind one of the musical symbol for *fortissimo*. There are many other examples of this sort of word play. "Mediterranean" becomes "muddy terranean" and "Botticelli" changes to "Bottisilli." The good humor and cleverness are unexceptionable, but can it be assumed that Joyce "has embraced the world, heaven, hell, and the celestial bodies . . . he has telescoped time, space, all humanity, and the universe of gods and heroes"<sup>8</sup> with this as typical evidence?

It is also problematical whether the insertion of river name after river name into this prose materially increases the reader's feeling for the mighty river of history. As an example: in the second version, the sentence "It's that irrawadying I've stuck in my aars" is inserted. This becomes, in the final attempt, "It's that irrawadying I've stoke in my aars." A third river is named. The sentence would read, more clearly, "It's that wadding I've stuck in my ears." The washerwoman cannot hear her neighbor very well. She is unaware that the river is getting wider as the stream of life and history gets broader and broader.

The next sentence, "It all but husheth the lethest sound," was also added in the second version and was not changed until the last edition, in which "sound" became "zswound." The original thought was not complex, and the changes which Joyce made neither contribute to the reader's awareness of the Viconian or psychological implications of the text nor do they add to the texture of the prose.

Again: the catalogue of laundry. In *Le Navire d'Argent*, it reads "Six shifts, ten kerchiefs, the convent napkins twelve, one baby's shawl." In *transition*: "Six shifts, ten kerchiefs, nine to hold the fire and this for the code, the convent napkins twelve, one baby's shawl." This last is kept in the finished *Finnegans Wake*. But Joyce's reading changes "fire and this for the code" to "fire and one for the code," and the 1945 correction of misprints alters "the convent napkins twelve" to "the convent napkins, twelve." It is not at all clear why these changes are made. They reinforce the impression, however, that the

<sup>8</sup> As Robert Sage states in "Before *Ulysses* and After," in Samuel Beckett and others, *Our Exagmination Round his Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress* (Paris, 1929), p. 155.

last revision contains alterations in the text made without any recognizable consistency of intention. And it is questionable whether such changes improve the text.

However, a variation in the language which does come closer to accomplishing Joyce's intention occurs when the original "What time is it?" becomes "What age is at?" in *transition*. The Viconian implications are clear. But "It must be late" is changed to "It saon is late"; the author takes the opportunity to insert still another river name.

The sentence after this one, "It's ages now since I or anyone last saw Waterhouse's clock" (first version), is changed first to "'Tis endless now since I or anyone last saw Waterhouse's clock." Next, in the Crosby Gaige edition, it becomes "'Tis endless now since eye or erewone last saw Waterhouse's clogh." *Finnegans Wake* changes "since" to "senne." "Clogh" is pronounced "clock" by Joyce in his recording of the passage. "Eye" makes the "clock" important to a larger world than did the "I" of the washerwoman, and "erewone" is related to *Erewhon*, but the latter relationship is not clear; and "eye" for "I" must be heard and seen at the same time if the pun is to be understood.

The eye alone can change the printed "dontelleries" into "don't-tell-eries," and only the ear can make the word equivalent to the French word for "face." In reading aloud, it would also be helpful to approximate Joyce's pronunciation. Only in this way could "Deataceas!" approximate "Deo Gratias!" which it is, among other things. Eye and ear together are necessary to get the point of "I'll lay a few stones on the hostel sheets." In the first version, "hostel" was "hotel"; therefore, examining the variants, it is clear that Joyce was punning again, this time with the word "hostile." This double effort demanded by Joyce from the reader-hearer would be most effective if the reading and the hearing were done first separately and then together, and the memory of the reader must be as enduring as his patience.

These difficulties can be multiplied many times. The basic point is that the comprehensibility of the text has been diminished by the "encrustation" of the individual words. Budgen quotes Joyce as saying that he created new words because a standard vocabulary was "inapt . . . to communicate the experiences of a dream or the myth of our race presented as a dream."<sup>9</sup> A private language was the result. Margaret Schlauch has called Joyce's experiments "polysemantic verbal patterns," that is, the words in a given passage [are distorted] so that they suggest at one and the same time not only the original normal ones but also another series of verbalisms which they now resemble. In order to convey these multiple phrases at once, it is important to respect the intonation of the whole as well as the individual words whose units of sound are being distorted. . . . Moreover, the words heard in overtone must be semantically related and must contribute to a single planned effect.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Frank Budgen, "Going Forth by Day," in *Given*, *op. cit.*, p. 350.

<sup>10</sup> Margaret Schlauch, "The Language of James Joyce," *Science and Society*, III (1939), 483.

The difficulty is that the complexity of the verbalism needs so much explication that the impact of the suggested meaning is weakened. William Troy has called *Finnegans Wake* "the verbal equivalent of the processes that are its subject and theme; the concrete realization of the identity of time and space."<sup>11</sup> But if, someday, a complete analysis of this "verbal equivalent" is attempted, it is likely that the "polysemantic" pattern would be reduced to several "monosemantic" ones. Its comprehensibility might make the *Wake* a routine exposition of familiar, simple themes. The stringent analysis which is necessary for comprehension destroys the original unity of the work of art.

It is interesting to note that the most praised parts of "Anna Livia Plurabelle" are often those sections which Joyce revised least. The beautiful last paragraph was changed very little. The paragraph reproduced below is taken from *Le Navire d'Argent*, with the changes made in the final *Finnegans Wake* indicated within brackets.

Can't hear with the waters of. The chittering waters of. Flittering bats, fieldmice bawk talk. Ho! Are you not gone ahome? What Tom [Thom] Malone? Can't hear with bawk of bats, all the [thim] liffeying waters of. Ho, talk save us! My foos won't moos. I feel as old as yonder elm. A tale told of Shaun or Shem? Who were Shem and Shaun the living sons or daughters of? Night now! Tell me, tell me, tell me, elm! Night night! Tell me tale [Telme-tale] of stem or stone. Beside the rivering waters of, hitherandthithering waters of. Night!

An examination of three versions of the paragraph before the one above indicates that the alterations made in the *transition* version are more significant than the later ones. But let the reader judge for himself:

#### I. *Le Navire d'Argent*:

Ah, but she was the queer old skeowsha anyhow, Anna Livia, twinkletoes. And sure he was the queer old buntz too, Dear Dirty Dumpling, foostherfather of fingalls and dotthergills. Gammer and gaffer we're all their gangsters. Hadn't he seven dams to wive him? And every dam had her seven crutches. And every crutch its seven hues. And each hue had a differing cry. Suds for me and supper for you and the doctor's bill for John Joe. Before! Before! He married his markets, cheap by foul, I know, but at milkidmass who was the spouse? Then all that was was fair. In Elvenland? Teems of times and happy returns. The same anew. Ordovico or viricordo. Anna was, Livia is, Plurabelle's to be. Northmen's thing made southfolk's place but howmulty plurators made eachone in person? Latin me that, my trinity scholar. *Hircus Civis Eblanensis!* He had buckgoat paps on him, soft ones for orphans. Ho, Lord! Twins of his bosom. Lord save us. And ho! Hey? What all men. Hot? His tittering daughters of. Whawk?

#### II. *transition*, No. 8:

Ah, but she was the queer old skeowsha anyhow, Anna Livia, trinkettoes. And sure he was the quare old buntz too, Dear Dirty Dumpling, foostherfather of fingalls and dotthergills. Gammer and gaffer we're all their gangsters. Hadn't he seven dams to wive him? And every dam had her seven crutches.

<sup>11</sup> Troy, *loc. cit.*, p. 309.

And-every crutch had its seven hues. And each hue had a differing cry. Sudds, for me and supper for you and the doctor's bill for Joe John. Before! Before! He married his markets, cheap by foul, I know, like any Etrurian Catholic Heathen, in their pinky limony creamy birnies and their turkiss indienne mauves. But at milkidmass who was the spouse? Then all that was was fair. In Elvenland? Teems of times and happy returns. The same anew. Ordovico or viricordo. Anna was, Livia is, Plurabelle's to be. Northmen's thing made southfolk's place but howmulty plurators made eachone in person? Latin me that, my trinity scholar, out of eure sanscreed into oure eryan. *Hircus Civis Eblanensis!* He had buckgoat paps on him, soft ones for orphans. Ho, Lord! Twins of his bosom. Lord save us! And ho! Hey? What all men. Hot? His tittering daughters of. Whawk?

### III. *Finnegans Wake*:

Ah, but she was the queer old sheowsha anyhow, Anna Livia, trinkettoes! And sure he was the quare old buntz too, Dear Dirty Dumphing, footherfather of fingalls and dotthergills. Gammer and gaffer [Gaffer and gammer] we're all their gangsters. Hadn't he seven dams to wive him? And every dam had her seven crutches. And every crutch had its seven hues. And each hue had a differing cry. Sudds for me and supper for you and the doctor's bill for Joe John. Befor! Bifur! He married his markets, cheap by foul, I know, like any Etrurian Catholic Heathen, in their pinky limony creamy birnies and their turkiss indienne mauves. But at milkidmass who was the spouse? Then all that was was fair. Tys Elvenland! Teems of times and happy returns. The seim anew. Ordovico or viricordo. Anna was, Livia is, Plurabelle's to be. Northmen's thing made southfolk's place but howmulty plurators made eachone in person? Latin me that, my trinity scholar, out of eure sanscreed into oure eryan. [!] *Hircus Civis Eblanensis!* He had buckgoat paps on him, soft ones for orphans. Ho, Lord! Twins of his bosom. Lord save us! And ho! Hey? What all men. Hot? His tittering daughters of. Whawk? [Final changes which Joyce made in the errata sheet and in the recording are indicated within brackets.]

The implications of these notes on the different texts of "Anna Livia Plurabelle" are, then, several. The language of the version which appeared in *Le Navire d'Argent* (1925) is somewhat similar to that of Molly Bloom's soliloquy. Most of what Joyce "said" in the final version seems to be already here. It is difficult prose, but not incomprehensible. It needs careful reading by a sympathetic reader, but such a reading should be granted all literature.

The greatest alterations were made in the time between the appearance of the fragment in *Le Navire d'Argent* and the publication of the *transition* text (1927). These are often effective, witness "trinkettoes" and "out of eure sanscreed into oure eryan" in the paragraph above. But certain of them, "quare" for "queer," and "Sudds," for "Suds," seem to increase the incomprehensibility of the prose without increasing its quality.

The text which Joyce chose as his final one is rendered still more complex than the second version, and there are occasional changes of meaning. For example, "In Elvenland?" becomes "Tys Elvenland!" "Same" becomes "seim" and "Before! Before!" becomes "Befor! Bifur!" to introduce puns which are difficult to decipher or evaluate. The added complexity seems, for the most part, arbitrary. The pun seems to be the end rather than the means to an end. This is not the

re-creation of our language which Jolas and the *transition* group have noted, but the private amusement of a highly literate cult.

Is it not possible, therefore, that "Anna Livia Plurabelle," and, by implication, the whole of *Finnegans Wake*, existed in its best form ten years before Joyce was through revising it; that he should have stopped his rewriting somewhere between the versions which appeared in *Le Navire d'Argent* and *transition*; and that, if he had done this, *Finnegans Wake* would have been more an epic and less a tour de force?

Brooklyn College

# A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CRITICAL ARTHURIAN LITERATURE FOR THE YEAR 1954

*Prepared by*

JOHN J. PARRY and PAUL A. BROWN

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ADA</i>	Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur
<i>Archiv</i>	Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen
<i>BBCS</i>	Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies
<i>BBSIA</i>	Bulletin Bibliographique de la Société Internationale Arthurienne
<i>BEC</i>	Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes
<i>Beiträge</i>	Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur
<i>Comp. Lit.</i>	Comparative Literature
<i>DAEM</i>	Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters
<i>Deu. Viertel.</i>	Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte
<i>DLZ</i>	Deutsche Literaturzeitung
<i>Eng. St.</i>	English Studies
<i>Et. Angl.</i>	Etudes Anglaises
<i>Et. Germ.</i>	Etudes Germaniques
<i>Fr. St.</i>	French Studies
<i>Ger. L. &amp; L.</i>	German Life and Letters
<i>GIF</i>	Giornali Italiano di Filologia
<i>GR</i>	Germanic Review
<i>GRM</i>	Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift
<i>GSLI</i>	Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana
<i>JEGP</i>	Journal of English and Germanic Philology
<i>Let. Rom.</i>	Les Lettres Romanes
<i>LTLS</i>	(London) Times Literary Supplement
<i>MA</i>	Le Moyen Age
<i>Med. Æ.</i>	Medium Ævum
<i>MLJ</i>	Modern Language Journal
<i>MLN</i>	Modern Language Notes
<i>MLQ</i>	Modern Language Quarterly
<i>MLR</i>	Modern Language Review
<i>Neophil.</i>	Neophilologus
<i>Neu. Spr.</i>	Die neueren Sprachen

Professor Parry died on the eighth of October, 1954. Apparently he had gathered material for the bibliography almost to the time of his death. From his notes and from the items I was able to gather within the time limit, this bibliography has been compiled. Most of the references which antedate 1953 and which had been omitted previously were discovered by Professor Parry and found in his notes.

I wish to express my gratitude to the following friends and scholars for constructive suggestions and, in some cases, even items: Robert W. Ackerman, Albert C. Baugh, Allan G. Chester, Edward G. Cox, Howard Meroney, William Roach, and Matthias A. Shaaber. Special thanks are due to the staffs of the periodical divisions in both the main library of the University of Pennsylvania and the Sullivan Memorial Library of Temple University for withholding the 1954 journals from the bindery during the months of February and March until I had had an opportunity to examine them.

P.A.B.



<i>Neuphil. Mit.</i>	Neuphilologische Mitteilungen
<i>NRFH</i>	Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica
<i>PMLA</i>	Publications of the Modern Language Association of America
<i>RES</i>	Review of English Studies
<i>Rev. Belge</i>	Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire
<i>RF</i>	Romanische Forschungen
<i>RLC</i>	Revue de littérature comparée
<i>RLR</i>	Revue des langues romanes
<i>Rom.</i>	Romania
<i>Rom. Phil.</i>	Romance Philology
<i>RR</i>	Romanic Review
<i>SP</i>	Studies in Philology
<i>WW</i>	Wirkendes Wort: Deutsches Sprachschaffen in Lehre und Leben
<i>YWES</i>	Year's Work in English Studies
<i>YWMLS</i>	Year's Work in Modern Language Studies
<i>ZDA</i>	Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum
<i>ZDPb</i>	Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie
<i>ZRPb</i>	Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie

3434. Ackerman, Robert W. *An Index of the Arthurian Names in Middle English*. 1952.

Rev. by J. A. W. Bennett in *MLR*, XLIX (1954), 221-222; by Jean Frappier in *Rom. Phil.*, VII (1953-54), 372-374; by Auvo Kurvinen in *Neuphil. Mit.*, LV (1954), 223-225; by Roger S. Loomis in *Speculum*, XXIX (1954), 244-246; by Kemp Malone in *Names*, II (1954), 64; by Robert H. Wilson in *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 100-104.

3743. ———. "U.S.A. and Canada. Bibliographie [*sic*] for 1953." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 20-30.

3435. Adler, Alfred. "A Structural Comparison of the two 'Folies Tristan.'" *Symposium*, VI (1952), 349-358.

Brief notice by A. E[wart] in *Fr. St.*, VIII (1954), 93.

3744. Adolf, Helen. "Tristan aux enfers." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 100-101.

3745. Ageno, Franca. "Nota sulle redazioni e le prime stampe del *Morgante*." *GSLI*, CXXX (1953), 508-513.

3746. Albrecht, William P. *The Loathly Lady in "Thomas of Erceldoune."* With a Text of the Poem Printed in 1652. (University of New Mexico Publications in Language and Literature, No. 11.) Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1954.

3747. ———. "A Seventeenth-Century Text of *Thomas of Erceldoune*." *Med. Æ.*, XXIII (1954), 88-95.

3748. Anon. "Gorseth Kernow." *Irisleabhar Ceilteach*, II (1954), 36-37. (Account, from the *Western Morning News*, of the 26th Gorseth of the Bards of Cornwall, involving the Ceremony of the Sword [symbolizing Excalibur] and the use of the theme of the Return of Arthur.)

3749. Anon. "Hartmann von Aue." *Der Große Brockhaus*.

Sechzehnte, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage in zwölf bänden. v (1954), 280. Wiesbaden: F. A. Brockhaus.

3750. Auden, W. H. "Balaam and the Ass: The Master-Servant Relationship in Literature." *Thought*, xxix (1954), 237-270. (Wagner, *Tristan and Isolde*, pp. 249-251.)

3596. Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. 1953.

Rev. by Donald Heiney in *Western Humanities Rev.*, viii (1953-54), 69-71; by Ants Oros in *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 444-448. See also Junker (3820).

3751. Bayerschmidt, Carl F. "Wolfram von Eschenbach's Christian Faith." *GR*, xxix (1954), 214-223. (Mainly a discussion of *Parzival*.)

3600. Bernheimer, Richard. *Wild Men in the Middle Ages*. 1953.

Rev. by H. Bausinger in *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, viii (1954), 174-176; by Siegfried Gutenbrunner in *DLZ*, LXXV (1954), 774-776; by Stanley Edgar Hyman in *Jour. of American Folklore*, LXVI (1953), 174-175; by Johnny Roosval in *Erasmus*, vii (1954), 221-223. Brief notice by A. I. Doyle in *RES*, v (1954), 328.

3752. Bezzola, Reto Raduolf. "Courtly Literature." *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of Literature* (3894), i, 121-123.

3753. Bindschedler, Maria. "Gottfried von Strassburg und die höfische Ethik." *Beiträge*, LXXVI (1954), 1-38.

3754. Blanchet, Marie-Claude. "Arthur chez Wace et Lawman." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 108.

3605b. de Boer, Helmut. *Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang, 1170-1250*. 1953.

Rev. (together with the same author's *Die deutsche Literatur von Karl dem Großen bis zum Beginn der höfischen Dichtung, 770-1170*) by Max Wehrli in *ADA*, LXVII (1954), 93-98.

3755. Bogdanow, Fanni. "The Post-Vulgate *Mort Artu*: La *Mort Artu* du cycle du 'pseudo-Robert de Borron.'" Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 106-107.

2545. Bøgholm, N. *The Layamon Texts*. 1943.

Brief rev. by Heinrich Ch. Matthes in *Anglia*, LXXI (1953), 480-481.

3756. Bohigas, P. "Espagne et Portugal. Bibliographie pour l'année 1953." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 34.

3757. Bostock, J. K. "The Falcon Song of der von Kürenberc." *MLR*, XLIX (1954), 59-60. (Uses a parallel from Wolfram's *Parzival*.)

3758. Brayer, Edith. "Manuscrits de 'roman bretons' photographiés à l'Institut de recherche et l'histoire des textes." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 79-84.

3759. Bromwich, Rachel. "The Character of the Early Welsh Tradition." *Studies in Early British History* (3768), pp. 83-136.

3760. Burchfield, R. W. "Geoffrey of Monmouth," I, 932; "Lazamon," II, 1152; "Sir Thomas Malory," II, 1207. *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of Literature* (3894).

Burger, Heinz Otto (ed.). *Annalen der deutschen Literatur*. 1951. (See *MLQ*, XIII [1952], 163; see also Kuhn, 3501.) *Ergänzungshefte*: (1) *Vergleichende Zeittafel zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. Von Kurt Herbert Halbach. 1952. (2) *Bibliographie zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. Von Otto Olzien. 1953.

Rev. (including both supplements) by Alan Holske in *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 453-456. See also Olzien (3870).

Rev. (without supplements) by Max Wehrli in *ADA*, LXVII (1954), 47-51; by J. R. Wilkie in *MLR*, XLIX (1954), 253-254.

3761. Caldwell, Robert A. "Geoffrey of Monmouth, Wace, and the Stour." *MLN*, LXIX (1954), 237-239.

3762. ————. "The 'History of the Kings of Britain' in College of Arms MS. Arundel XXII." *PMLA*, LXIX (1954), 643-654.

3763. ————. "Wace's *Brut* and the *Variant Version* of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 109.

3608. Camproux, Ch. *Histoire de la littérature occitane*. 1953.

Rev. by J. Bourciez in *RLR*, LXXI (1954), 382-383; by Harald List in *Neu. Spr.*, Jahrgang 1953, pp. 559-560; by K. Sneyders de Vogel in *Neophil.*, xxxviii (1954), 69-70.

3764. Carney, J. P. "Irish Analogies to the Tristan Story." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 95.

3765. Chadwick, Hector Munro. "The End of Roman Britain." *Studies in Early British History* (3768), pp. 9-20. (Discusses Gildas and Nennius.)

3766. ————. "The Foundation of the Early British Kingdoms." *Studies in Early British History* (3768), pp. 47-56. (Discusses the genealogy of Arthur.)

3767. ————. "Vortigern." *Studies in Early British History* (3768), pp. 21-33.

3768. ————, Nora K. Chadwick, Kenneth Jackson, Rachel Bromwich, Peter Hunter Blair, Owen Chadwick. *Studies in Early British History*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1954. (See 3759, 3765-67, 3770-71.)

Rev. by E. Polomé in *Latomus*, XIII (1954), 279-280.

3769. Chadwick, Nora K. "The Lost Literature of Celtic Scotland: Caw of Pritdin and Arthur of Britain." *Scottish Gaelic Studies*, VII, Pt. 2 (1953), pp. 115-183.

3770. ————. "A Note on Constantine, Prince of Devon." *Studies in Early British History* (3768), pp. 56-60.

3771. ———. "A Note on the Name Vortigern." *Studies in Early British History* (3768), pp. 34-46.

3772. Clark, Cecily. "A Mediæval Proverb." *Eng. St.*, xxxv (1954), 11-15. (Example from Gottfried's *Tristan*.)

3449. Cohen, Gustave. *La Poésie en France au moyen âge*. 1952. Rev. by J. Horrent in *MA*, LIX (1953), 198.

3316. ———. *La Vie littéraire en France au moyen âge*. 1949. Second edition. Paris: Tallandier, 1953.

Rev. in *LTLS*, June 11, 1954, p. 374; by Robert J. Clements in *Speculum*, xxix (1954), 795-798.

3773. Copley, Gordon J. *The Conquest of Wessex in the Sixth Century*. London: Phoenix House, 1954. (Allusions to Arthur and to Mons Badonicus.)

Rev. in *LTLS*, March 12, 1954, p. 166.

3774. Cowper, F. A. G. "Supplementary Material on Gautier d'Arras." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 110.

3775. Cremonesi, Carla. "Italie. Bibliographie Arthurienne pour l'année 1953." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 50.

3614. Cross, Tom Peete. *Motif-Index of Early Irish Literature*. 1952.

Rev. by Kenneth H. Jackson in *Speculum*, xxix (1954), 548-551; by Seán Ó Súilleabháin in *Jour. of American Folklore*, LXVII (1954), 318-319.

3776. Curtis, Renée L. "An Unnoticed Family of 'Prose Tristan' Manuscripts." *MLR*, XLIX (1954), 428-433.

3074a. Curtius, Ernst Robert. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. 1948.

Brief notice in *Imago Mundi*, I (1953), 119-120.

3777. Dahl, Curtis. "Morris's 'The Chapel in Lyones': An Interpretation." *SP*, LI (1954), 482-491.

3778. Daube, David. "Addendum to 'The Date of *The Birth of Merlin*.'" *Aberdeen Univ. Rev.*, xxxv (1953), 147. (Cf. 3614a.)

3779. Delbouille, Maurice. "Notes de Philologie et de Folklore: 1. La Légende de Herlekin; 2. Les Origines du lutin Pacolèt." Off-print from *Bulletin de la Société de Langue et de Littérature wallonnes*, LXIX (1953). 40 pp.

3459. Dickins, Bruce, and R. M. Wilson. *Early Middle English Texts*. 1951. Second (revised) impression. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1952.

Notice by Hans Marcus in *Archiv*, CLXXXIX (1953), 365.

3780. Draak, [A.] Maartje [E.]. *De Middelnederlandse Vertalingen van de Proza-Lancelot*. (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, New Series, xvii, 7.) Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1954.

3781. ————. "Netherlands. Arthurian Bibliography 1953." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 51-52.

3782. ————. "Plea for a team-work investigation by (the) members of the International Arthurian Society: The collating of all the MSS. of the *Lancelot en prose*." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 103.

3621a. ———— (ed.). *Lancelot en het Hert met de Witte Voet*. 1953.

Notice by Gilbert Degroote in *Rev. Belge*, xxxii (1954), 914; by Fernand Mossé in *Et. Germ.*, ix (1954), 168-169.

2960. Dubois, Marguerite-Marie. *Le Roman d'Arthur et des chevaliers de la Table Ronde*. 1948.

Rev. by E. Pons in *Et. Angl.*, vii (1954), 246-247.

3783. Duval, Michel. *La Forêt de Breclien et ses très anciens usements*. Rennes: Le Cercle de Brocéliande, 1954.

Rev. (together with de Séchelles, *L'Origine du Graal*, 3887) by C. Foulon in *Ann. de Bretagne*, lxi (1954), 209-211.

3784. Eggers, Hans. "Strukturprobleme mittelalterlicher Epik, dargestellt am Parzival Wolframs von Eschenbach." *Euphorion*, xlvii (1953), 260-270.

3785. ———— and Eduard Neumann. "Gottfried von Strassburg in neuer Sicht." *Euphorion*, xlviii (1954), 472-490. (Based on 3729. Weber, Gottfried. *Gottfrieds von Strassburg "Tristan" und die Krise des hochmittelalterlichen Weltbildes um 1200*. 1953.)

3786. Eis, Gerhard. "Ulrich von Türlheim," iv, 603-608; "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven," iv, 621-625; "Wirnt von Grafenberg," iv, 1027-32. *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon* (3830).

3084. ———— (ed.). *Mittelhochdeutsche Lieder und Sprüche*. 1949.

Brief rev. by F. R. Schröder in *GRM*, iv (1954), 71.

3323a. Emmel, Hildegard. *Formprobleme des Artusromans und der Galdichtung*. 1951.

Rev. by Robert W. Ackerman in *Rom. Phil.*, vii (1953-54), 225-227; by Luigi Lun in *GIF*, vi (1953), 189-191.

3787. F., C. "Le Congrès arthurien de Rennes (17-24 Août 1954)." *Ann. de Bretagne*, lxi (1954), 212-215.

3788. Fahlin, Carin. "La Femme innocente exilée dans une forêt. Motif folklorique de la littérature medievale." *Mélanges Michaëlsson* (3855), pp. 138-148. ("III. Brangien, servante d'Iseut," 136-138.)

3789. Falconer, S. "Ireland. Arthurian Bibliography 1953." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 48-49.

3468. Favati, Guido. "La Canzone d'amore del Cavalcanti." *Letterature moderne*, iii (1952), 422-453.

Notice (anon.) in *Studi Petrarqueschi*, iv (1951), 305-306; by H. Lausberg in *Archiv*, cxc (1954), 281.

3790. Ferreira da Cunha, Celso. *A margem da poética trovador-esca*. Rio de Janeiro, 1950.

Rev. by Manuel Rodrigues Lapa in *NRFH*, VIII (1954), 81-86.

3325. Fierz-Monnier, Antoinette. *Initiation und Wandlung*. 1951.

Rev. by Alexandre Micha in *ZRPh*, LXX (1954), 148-153.

3791. Fluttre, L.-F. "Nouveau fragments du manuscrit dit d'Annonay des œuvres de Chrétien de Troyes." *Rom.*, LXXV (1954), 1-21. (Two leaves of *Cligès* and some fragments; two leaves of *Yvain*.)

3792. Foulon, C. "Les deux humiliations de Lancelot." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 102.

3793. ———, J. Frappier, and P. Le Gentil. "France. Bibliographie pour l'année 1953." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 35-42.

3794. Fourquet, Jean. "Thèses sur le *Minnesang*." *Et. Germ.*, IX (1954), 1-15. (Courtly love; Arthurian characters.)

3795. Fox, John Howard. *Robert de Blois, son œuvre didactique et narrative*. Paris: Librairie Nizet [1950]. (Includes comparisons between *Beaudous* and other Arthurian works.)

Rev. by Alexandre Micha in *ZRPh*, LXX (1954), 146-148.

3796. Françon, Marcel. "La Géographie de *Pantagruel* et les Chroniques Gargantuines." *MLN*, LXIX (1954), 260-264.

3627. Frank, István. *Trouvères et Minnesänger*. 1952.

Rev. by R. Bossuat in *BEC*, CXI (1953), 291-294; by Cl. Margueron in *RLR*, LXXI (1954), 342-343; by K. S[neyders] d[e] V[ogel] in *Neophil.*, XXXVIII (1954), 145-146. Brief rev. by Albert Henry in *Rev. Belge*, XXXII (1954), 903; by John Orr in *MLR*, XLIX (1954), 393; by Joachim Störöst in *Archiv*, CXC (1954), 355.

3797. Frappier, Jean. "Bibliographies Diverses." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 53.

3798. ———. "Le Graal et la Chevalerie." *Rom.*, LXXV (1954), 165-210.

3799. ———. "Plaidoyer pour l' 'Architecte', contre une opinion d'Albert Pauphilet sur le *Lancelot en prose*." *Rom. Phil.*, VIII (1954), 27-33.

3800. ———. "A propos du 'grail tresto descobert.'" *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 75-78.

3474. ——— (ed.). *Bulletin Bibliographique de la Société Internationale Arthurienne*. No. 4, Paris, 1952. No. 5, Paris, 1953. No. 6, Paris, 1954. (No. 6 includes "Le Congrès de Rennes," pp. 87-95; "Courrier arthurien," pp. 85-124; and "Liste des Membres," pp. 125-145.)

No. 4 rev. by Fernand Mossé in *Et. Angl.*, VII (1954), 109-110. Brief rev. of No. 5 by M. R. in *Rom.*, LXXV (1954), 132.

3801. ——— (ed.). *La Mort le roi Artu, roman du XIII<sup>e</sup>*

siècle. (Textes littéraires français.) Genève: Droz; Lille: Giard, 1954.

Rev. by G. Gougenheim in *le français moderne*, xxiii (1955), 69-70; by Arthur Långfors in *Neuphil. Mit.*, lv (1954), 213-214. Brief rev. by A. E. in *Fr. St.*, ix (1955), 89.

———. See C. Foulon (3793).

3802. Frauwallner, E., H. Giebisch, and E. Heinzel (eds.). *Die Welt-Literatur*. Wien: Hollinek. I Band, A-G, 1951; II Band, G-O, 1953. ("Artusromane," I, 97-98; "Chrestien de Troyes," I, 297-298; "Eilhart von Oberg," I, 426; "Gottfried von Strassburg," I, 619-620; "Gral-Romane," I, 626; "Hartmann von Aue," II, 690-691.)

3802a. Friedman, Albert B. "The First Draft of Percy's *Reliques*." *PMLA*, LXIX (1954), 1233-49. (Contains Arthurian ballads.)

3803. ———. "Percy's Folio Manuscript Revalued." *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 524-531. (Contains a reference to "King Ryence's Challenge.")

3804. Fromm, Hans. "Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Gottfried-Forschung." *Deu. Viertel.*, xxviii (1954), 115-138.

Giebisch, H. See E. Frauwallner (3802).

3805. Gourvil, F. "Le Barzaz-Breiz et la littérature arthurienne." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 110-111.

3806. Gregory, Mair. "Nodiadau Bywgraffyddol: (ii) Albert Schulz ('San Marte') (1802-1893)." *Llên Cymru*, III (1954), 41.

3633. Gruffydd, W. J. *Rhiannon: An Inquiry into the Origins of the First and Third Branches of the Mabinogi*. 1953.

Rev. by A. O. H. Jarman in *Llên Cymru*, III (1954), 123-128.

3479. Gunn, Alan M. F. *The Mirror of Love*. 1952.

Rev. by Jean Frappier in *RLC*, xxviii (1954), 93-96. See also Muscatine (3859).

3807. Guyer, Foster Erwin. *Romance in the Making: Chrétien de Troyes and the Earliest French Romances*. New York: Vanni [1954].

3808. Halbach, Kurt Herbert. "Epik des Mittelalters." *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß* (3892), II, 455-710. (Wolfram, 576-617; Gottfried, 617-627; Albrecht, 676-680, etc.).

3339. Hammer, Jacob. *Geoffrey of Monmouth "Historia Regum Britanniae." A Variant Version*. 1951.

Rev. by M. Hélin in *Rev. Belge*, xxxii (1954), 122-124.

3809. Hamp, Eric P. "*Viviane* or *Niniane*?—A Comment from the Keltic Side." *Rom. Phil.*, VIII (1954), 91. (Cf. Nitzke, 3863.)

3481. Hartl, Eduard. *Wolfram von Eschenbach. Parzival*. In *Auswahl herausgegeben*. 1951.

Brief notice by F. M. in *Archiv*, CLXXXIX (1953), 224.



3810. ———. "Wolfram von Eschenbach." *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon* (3830), iv, 1058-91.

3485. Hay, Denys. *Polydore Vergil*. 1952.

Rev. in *LTLS*, May 23, 1952, p. 349; by R. W[eiss] in *Italian Studies*, viii (1953), 96-97.

3811. Heather, P. J. "Divination." *Folk-Lore*, lxxv (1954), 10-29, 87-102. (References to Lazamon's *Brut*, Gawayne and the *Grene Knight*, the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, etc.)

Heinzel, E. See E. Frauwallner (3802).

3340. Helm, Karl, and Walter Ziesemer. *Die Literatur des deutschen Ritterordens*. 1951.

Rev. by Gerhard Eis in *ZDPv*, lxxiii (1954), 120-122.

1093. Hoepfner, E. "*La Folie Tristan*" de Berne. 1934. Second edition, 1949.

Rev. by R. van Waard in *ZRPh*, lxx (1954), 434-435.

3812. Hofer, Stefan. *Chrétien de Troyes: Leben und Werke des altfranzösischen Epikers*. Graz, Köln: Böhlau, 1954.

Rev. by K. S[neyders] d[e] V[ogel] in *Neophil.*, xxxviii (1954), 312-313.

3813. ———. "Kritische Bemerkungen zum *Lai de Guingamor*." *RF*, lxxv (1954), 360-377.

3814. Holmes, Urban T., Jr. "The Post-Bédier Theories on the Origins of the *Chansons de Geste*." *Speculum*, xxx (1955), 72-81, (Arthurian allusions.)

3815. Holthausen, Ferdinand. "Zum Sir Gawain and the Carl of Carlisle." *Archiv*, cxc (1954), 315-319. (Suggested emendations.)

3816. Horacek, Blanka. "Die Kunst des Enjambements bei Wolfram von Eschenbach." *ZDA*, lxxxv (1954), 210-229.

3817. Imbs, Paul. "Enygeus." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 63-73.

3342a. Ivy, Robert H., Jr. *The MS. Relations of Manessier's Continuation of the Old French "Perceval"*. 1951.

Rev. by R. Bossuat in *BEC*, cxI (1953), 295-297; by Albert W. Thompson, together with the *Perceval Continuations* (3158), in *Speculum*, xxx (1955), 124-129. Brief notice by O. J[odogne] in *Let. Rom.*, viii (1954), 186.

———. See also Roach, William (3158).

3818. Jackson, Kenneth. *Language and History in Early Britain: A Chronological Survey of the Brittonic Languages, First to Twelfth Century A.D.* (Edinburgh Univ. Publications, Lang. and Lit., No. 4.) Edinburgh: The University Press, 1953. (Arthurian background.)

Rev. by J. J. Parry in *Speculum*, xxx (1955), 108-110; by E. Polomé in *Latomus*, xiii (1954), 257-258. Brief notice in *LTLS*, January 15, 1954, p. 47.

3346. Jarman, A. O. H. *Ymddiddan Myrddin a Thaliesin*. 1951.

Rev. by Rachel Bromwich in *Med. Æ.*, xxiii (1954), 112-114.

3819. Jones, Thomas (trans. and ed.). *Brut y Tywysogion or The Chronicle of the Princes, Peniarth MS. 20 Version, Translated*

with *Introduction and Notes*. (Board of Celtic Studies, Univ. of Wales, History and Law Series, No. XI.) Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press, 1952.

Rev. by A. O. H. Jarman in *Llên Cymru*, III (1954), 53-55; by J. J. Parry in *Speculum*, XXIX (1954), 289-290.

3116b. Joos, Martin, and Frederick R. Whitesell. *Middle High German Courtly Reader*. 1949, 1951.

Rev. by Herman C. Meyer in *MLQ*, xv (1954), 190-191; by Heinz Rupp in *Euphorion*, XLVII (1953), 112-113.

3820. Junker, Albert. "Zum Problem des Realismus in der Literatur." *Neu. Spr.*, Jahrgang 1954, pp. 446-452. (Discusses Auerbach's *Mimesis* (2754) and some criticisms of it.)

3655. Keller, H.-E. *Etude descriptive sur le vocabulaire de Wace*. 1953.

Rev. by Wilhelm Giese in *Neu. Spr.*, Jahrgang 1954, pp. 287-288.

3821. Keller, R. E. "German: Medieval Literature. On Wolfram von Eschenbach." *YWMLS*, XIII, 1951 (1952), 248-249.

3822. ———. "German: Medieval Literature." *YWMLS*, xiv, 1952 (1953), 232-243. (Includes "Hartman von Aue," "Wolfram von Eschenbach," and "German and Austrian Theses.")

3823. Kellermann, Wilhelm, Eduard Neumann, and Joachim Thiel. "Allemagne et Autriche. Bibliographie pour l'année 1953." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 15-19.

3824. Kennedy, E. M. "Un épisode du Lancelot en prose: Hector au château de l'estroite Marche. (Etude de genèse)." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 104.

Kienast, Richard (ed.). *Studien zur deutschen Philologie des Mittelalters*. 1950. (*Panzer Studien*; see *MLQ*, XII [1951], 166.)

Rev. by Carl Selmer in *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 233; see also Peuckert (3872).

3825. Klein, Karl Kurt. "Wolframs Selbstverteidigung." *ZDA*, LXXXV (1954), 150-162.

2885. Kosch, Wilhelm. *Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon*. Zweite Auflage. Erster Band. Bern: A. Francke, 1949. Zweiter Band, 1953. ("Gottfried von Strassburg," I, 704-705; "Gral," I, 715-716; "Heinrich von Freiberg," II, 900; "Heinrich von dem Türlin," II, 905; "Merlin," II, 1708; "Minnesang," II, 1741-43.)

Notice by Fernand Mossé on Parts 20-22 in *Et. Germ.*, IX (1954), 175.

3826. Kuen, Heinrich, et al. (eds.). *Festgabe Ernst Gamillscheg zu seinem fünfundsiebzehnten Geburtstag am 28. Oktober 1952 von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1952. (See Louis, 3843.)

Notice by W. Theodor Elwert in *Archiv*, cxc (1954), 348-349.

3827. Kuhn, Alwin. *Bibliographie 1940-1950*. Supplement zu Band 60-66, *ZRPh*. Lieferung 5. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1954.

("C. i. IV. Motivgeschichte: 2. Arthuriana. 3. Gral. 4. Tristan," pp. 340-343.)

3828. Kuhn, Hugo. "Wigamur." *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon* (3830), IV, 962-964.

3353. Kurvinen, Auvo. *Sir Gawain and the Carle of Carlisle in Two Versions*. 1951.

Rev. by R. Derolez in *Scriptorium*, VIII (1954), 167. Brief notice by E[dith] B[rayer] in *BEC*, CX (1952) 301; by Heinrich Ch. Matthes in *Archiv*, CLXXXIX (1953), 227.

3502. Lachmann, Karl (ed.). *Wolfram von Eschenbach*. 1952.

Rev. by R.-M. S. Heffner in *Monatshefte*, XLVI (1954), 152-153; by Francis J. Nock in *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 96-98; by Werner Wolf in *ADA*, LXVII (1954), 61-71.

3829. Ladner, Gerhart B. "Bibliographical Survey: The History of Ideas in the Christian Middle Ages from the Fathers to Dante in American and Canadian Publications of the Years 1940-1952." *Traditio*, IX (1953), 439-514. ("King Arthur, the Holy Grail, and Related Ideas," pp. 486-490.)

3830. Langosch, Karl (ed.). *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*. Band IV, Saaburg-Zwinger. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953. (See 3786, 3810, 3828.)

Notice on Band IV, Lief. 3, Valder-Zwinger, by F. M. in *Archiv*, cxc (1954), 329; by Fernand Mossé in *Et. Germ.*, ix (1954), 175-176; by W. Schwarz in *Ger. L & L*, VIII (1954), 74.

3236. van der Lee, Anthony. *Der Stil von Hartmanns Erec verglichen mit dem älteren Epik*. 1950.

Rev. by Hans Eggers in *Euphorion*, XLVIII (1954), 102-104.

3661. Le Gentil, Pierre. "La Légende de Tristan vue par Béroul et Thomas. Essai d'interprétation." *Rom. Phil.*, VII (1953-54), 111-129.

Notice by A. E. in *Fr. St.*, IX (1955), 96-97.

———. See C. Foulon (3793).

3831. Legge, M. Dominica. "Encore la date du Tristan de Thomas." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 95-96.

3832. Lejeune, Rita. "Colloque international de la littérature du Graal." *MA*, LX (1954), 251-252.

3833. ————. "La date du Conte du Graal de Chrétien de Troyes." *MA*, LX (1954), 51-79.

3834. ————. "Mentions de Tristan chez les Troubadours." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 96-97.

3663. ————. "Le Roman de Jaufré, source de Chrétien de Troyes?" *Rev. Belge*, XXXI (1953), 717-747.

Brief notice by A. E. in *Fr. St.*, VIII (1954), 385.

3835. Locke, Frederick William. "A New Approach to the Study of the *Queste del Saint Graal*." *RR*, XLV (1954), 241-250.

3666. Lods, Jeanne. *Le Roman de Perceforest*. Vol. II: *Les Pièces lyriques*. 1953.

Brief rev. by J. Bourciez in *RLR*, LXXI (1954), 385; by K. S[neyders] d[e] V[ogel] in *Neophil.*, xxxviii (1954), 148.

3836. ———. "Les parties lyriques du *Tristan* en prose." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 104-105.

3837. Loomis, Laura Hibbard. "The Holy Relics of Charlemagne and King Athelstan: the Lances of Longinus and St. Mauricius." *Speculum*, xxv (1950), 437-456.

3838. ———. "The Oriflamme of France and the War-Cry 'Monjoie' in the Twelfth Century." *Studies in Art and Literature for Belle da Costa Greene* (3856), 67-82. (Allusion to the Passion Lance, p. 76.)

3839. ———. "The Passion Lance Relic and the War Cry Monjoie in the *Chanson de Roland* and Related Texts." *RR*, xli (1950), 241-260. (Contains allusion to the Bleeding Lance in Chrétien's *Perceval*.)

3840. Loomis, Roger Sherman. "Bruce's Conception of the History of Lancelot." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 101-102.

3841. ———. "Grail Problems." *RR*, xlv (1954), 12-17. (Reply to William A. Nitze, *Rom. Phil.*, vi (1952), 14-22.)

———. See also K. G. T. Webster (3421).

3842. Loos, Paul Arthur. *Richard Wagner: Vollendung und Tragik der deutschen Romantik*. Bern: A. Francke, 1952.

Rev. by Maurice Boucher in *Et. Germ.*, ix (1954), 233-234; by Edvard Fendler in *Books Abroad*, xxix (1955), 73.

3843. Louis, René. "Le Préfixe inorganique *es-* dans le noms propres en ancien français." *Festgabe Ernst Gamillscheg* (3826), pp. 66-76. (Includes "*Caliburn-Escalibor*, *Cavalon-Escavalon*, *Pandragon-Espandragon*," pp. 69-75.)

3844. ——— (trans.). *Chrétien de Troyes. Erec et Enide, roman traduit de l'ancien français d'après l'édition de Mario Roques*. Paris: Champion, 1954.

3845. Lumiansky, R. M. "Aspects of the Relationship of Boccaccio's 'Il Filostrato' with Benoit's 'Roman de Troie' and Chaucer's 'Wife of Bath's Tale.'" *Italica*, xxxi (1954), 1-7.

3846. Lyons, Faith. "'Entencion' in Chrétien's *Lancelot*." *SP*, li (1954), 425-430. (Cf. D. W. Robertson, Jr., *SP*, xlviii [1951], 669-692 [3396].)

3517. ———. "Hun de Méry's *Tournoiment d'Antéchrist* and the *Queste del Saint Graal*." *Fr. St.*, vi (1952), 213-218.

Brief rev. by Pierre Cezard in *Rom.*, Lxxv (1954), 430-431.

3847. Macdonald, A. "A Note on Sir Gawain and the Green Knight." *Eng. St.*, xxxv (1954), 15.

3848. Mandra, Raymond. "The Passing of a Scholar: Professor Jacob Hammer, 1894-1953." *Latomus*, xiii (1954), 3-7. (Contains a list of his studies on Geoffrey of Monmouth.)

3672. Mariani, Gaetano. *Il "Morgante" e i cantari trecenteschi*. 1953.

Rev. by Mario Santoro in *GIF*, vii (1954), 93-94.

3522. Marx, Jean. *La Légende arthurienne et le Graal*. 1952.

Rev. by Rita Lejeune in *MA*, lx (1954), 181-190; by Alexandre Micha in *ZRPh*, lxx (1954), 428-434. Brief notice in *Imago Mundi*, i (1953), 119. See also C. J. Sisson (3889).

3849. ———. "Observation sur un épisode de la légende de Tristan." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 97-99.

3850. ———. [Reply to Vinaver's review of *La Légende arthurienne et le Graal* in *Med. Æ.*, xxii (1953), 25-27.] *Med. Æ.*, xxiii (1954), 131-132.

3851. Mason, Eugene (trans.). *Lays of Marie de France and Other French Legends*. (Everyman's Library, No. 557.) London: Dent, 1954. (Reprint; first published in 1911.)

Brief rev. by A. Ewart in *Fr. St.*, viii (1954), 383.

3373. Mergell, Bodo. *Der Gral in Wolframs Parzival*. 1952.

Rev. by Helen Adolf in *Speculum*, xxix (1954), 295-300; by Urban T. Holmes, Jr., in *Comp. Lit.*, vi (1954), 183-185.

3852. ———. "Wolfram und der Gral in neuem Licht." *Euphorion*, xlvii (1953), 431-451.

3853. Micha, Alexandre. "Deux études sur le Graal. II: Le 'livre du Graal' de Robert de Boron." *Rom.*, lxxv (1954), 316-352.

3854. ———. "Sur trois vers du Joseph de Robert de Boron (v. 2785-2787)." *Rom.*, lxxv (1954), 240-243.

3855. [Michaëlsson, *Mélanges*.] *Mélanges de philologie romane offerts à M. Karl Michaëlsson par ses amis et ses élèves*. Göteborg, 1952. (See 3788.)

Critical summary by M. R. in *Rom.*, lxxv (1954), 547-550.

3856. Miner, Dorothy (ed.). *Studies in Art and Literature for Belle da Costa Greene*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1954. (See 3838, 3880.)

3531a. del Monte, Alberto. *Tristano*. 1952.

Rev. by Urban T. Holmes, Jr., in *Speculum*, xxix (1954), 150-152; by K. Sneyders de Vogel in *Erasmus*, vii (1954), 398-401; by Bartina H. Wind in *Rom. Phil.*, viii (1954), 142-144. Rev. (together with Giuseppe E. Sansoni, *Gli insegnamenti di cortesia in lingua d'oc e d'oïl*) by Aldo Valloni in *GIF*, vii (1954), 285-287. Brief rev. by J. Bourciez in *RLR*, lxxi (1954), 372; by André Gooze in *Rev. Belge*, xxxii (1954), 339; by O. J[odogne] in *Let. Rom.*, viii (1954), 293-294.

3857. Moret, A. "Deux ouvrages recents sur Wolfram et la légende du Graal." *Et. Germ.*, ix (1954), 46-48. (Mergell, *Der Gral in Wolframs Parzival*, 3373; Schröder, *Der Ritter zwischen Welt und Gott*, 3562.)

3858. Moser, Hugo. "Dichtung und Wirklichkeit im Hochmittelalter: Ein Vortrag." *WW*, v (1954-55), 79-91. (Contains some discussion of Gottfried, Hartmann, and Wolfram.)

3859. Muscatine, Charles. "The Emergence of Psychological Allegory in Old French Romance." *PMLA*, LXVIII (1953), 1160-82. (Allusions to Chrétien, *passim*; note on Alan M. F. Gunn, *The Mirror of Love* [3479], p. 1182, n. 48.)

3682. Muschg, Walter. *Tragische Literaturgeschichte*. 1953.

Rev. by C. P. Magill in *MLR*, XLIX (1954), 384.

3683. Nagel, Burt. *Der arme Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue*. 1952.

Rev. by Hans Eggers in *Euphorion*, XLVIII (1954), 102-104; by Karl-Eberhard Henke in *DAEM*, x (1953), 603.

3860. National Library of Wales. *Bibliotheca Celtica: A Register of Publications Relating to Wales and the Celtic Peoples & Languages*. Third Series, Vol. I, 1953. Aberystwyth, 1954. ("Arthurian Literature," pp. 35-39.)

3256. Nelli, René (ed.). *Lumière du Graal*. 1951.

Brief notice by F. M. in *Archiv*, CLXXXIX (1953), 224.

3861. Neumann, Eduard. "Die Dichtung des 12. Jahrhunderts in neuer Mittelalterschau." *WW*, iv (1953-54), 203-209.

———. See also Hans Eggers (3785) and Wilhelm Kellermann (3823).

3862. Newstead, Helaine. "News of Arthurian Scholars and Their Activities." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 116-123. ("Editions of Arthurian Texts," "Critical and Historical Studies," "Varia," "Dissertations.")

3863. Nitze, William A. "An Arthurian Crux: Viviane or Nini-ane?" *Rom. Phil.*, VII (1953-54), 326-330. (Cf. Hamp, 3809.)

3864. ————. "Le Bruiden celtique et le château du Graal." *Rom.*, LXXV (1954), 231-240.

3865. ————. "Le Bruiden et la lance-qui-saigne." *Rom.*, LXXV (1954), 512-520.

3866. ————. "Conjointure in *Erec*, VS. 14." *MLN*, LXIX (1954), 180-181.

3867. ————. "Correspondence (on *RPh.*, VII, 171-175)." *Rom. Phil.*, VIII (1954), 70. (On "the Blanche-flor-Perceval relationship." Comment on Newstead [3685], and Sister M. Amelia Klenke, *Rom. Phil.*, VI (1952-53), 173-178 [3500].)

3868. ———. "Erec and the Joy of the Court." *Speculum*, xxix (1954), 691-701.

2806. Nykl, A. R. *Hispano-Arabic Poetry and its Relations with the Old Provençal Troubadours*. 1946.

Brief rev. by F. R. Schröder in *GRM*, iv (1954), 69-70.

3869. [Öhmann, Emil, *Festschrift*.] *Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae)*, Ser. B, Tom. 84. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1954. (See 3910.)

Rev. by William H. Bennett in *Speculum*, xxx (1955), 130-131. Brief notice by Fernand Mossé in *Et. Germ.*, ix (1954), 173.

3870. Olzien, Otto. *Bibliographie zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. Zweites Ergänzungsheft zu den *Annalen der deutschen Literatur*, herausgegeben von Heinz Otto Burger. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1953. (Wolfram, p. 138; etc.)

Notice by Fernand Mossé in *Et. Germ.*, ix (1954), 176-177. (See also Burger, *Annalen*.)

3871. Parry, John J. "A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1953." *MLQ*, xv (1954), 147-167.

3265. Patch, Howard Rollin. *The Other World According to Descriptions in Medieval Literature*. 1950.

Rev. by María Rosa Lida de Malkiel in *Rom. Phil.*, viii (1954), 52-54.

3872. Peuckert, W.-E. "Festschriften." *ZDPh*, LXXIII (1954), 233-237. (Reviews, *inter alia*, *Erbe der Vergangenheit* [1951; see Ludwig Wolff] and *Panzer Studien* [see Richard Kienast].)

3873. Philipps, K. C. "Contamination in Late Middle English." *Eng. St.*, xxxv (1954), 17-20. (Includes examples from Malory.)

3874. Pickering, Frederick P. "Gottfried von Strassburg," I, 958-959; "Hartmann von Aue," I, 999-1000; "Ulrich von Türheim," II, 1581; "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven," II, 1581-82; "Wolfram von Eschenbach," II, 1646-47. *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of Literature* (3894).

3875. Pickford, Cedric E. "Le Développement du roman cyclique (Subdivisions of the prose romances)." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 107-108.

3545. ——— (ed.). *Alixandre l'Orphelin*. 1951.

Brief rev. by N. S. Bement in *Rom. Phil.*, vii (1953-54), 400.

3697. Ranke, Friedrich. *Gott, Welt, und Humanität in der deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters*. 1952, 1953.

Rev. by Wolfgang Mohr in *Euphorion*, XLVIII (1954), 491-492. Notice by F. M. in *Archiv*, cxc (1954), 330.

3876. Reinhold, Heinz. *Humoristische Tendenzen in der englischen Dichtung des Mittelalters*. (Buchreihe der Anglia, Band 4.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1953. (*Lazamon's Brut*, the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, and *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*.)

Rev. by L. Cazamian in *Et. Angl.*, vii (1954), 134-135; by R. H. Llewellyn in *MLN*, LXIX (1954), 366-367; by Wolfgang Schmidt-Hidding in *Neu. Spr.*, Jahrgang 1954, pp. 94-95; by R. M. Wilson in *MLR*, XLIX (1954), 538-539.



3877. Remy, Paul. "Belgique. Bibliographie pour l'année 1953." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 31-33.

3550. Richey, Margaret Fitzgerald. "Wolfram von Eschenbach and the Paradox of the Chivalrous Life." 1952.

Brief notice by Rudolf Majut in *Deutschunterricht für Ausländer*, iv (1954), 20.

3878. Riquer, Martin de. "La Date du roman de *Jaufré*." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 111.

2419. Roach, William. *The Didot "Perceval."* 1941.

Rev. by Pere Bohigas in *Estudis Romànics*, i (1947-48), 272-273.

3158. ——— and Robert H. Ivy, Jr. *Perceval Continuations*.

Vol. II, 1950. Rev. by Percival B. Fay in *Rom. Phil.*, viii (1954), 66.

Vol. III, Part I, 1952. Rev. by J. Bourciez in *RLR*, lxxi (1954), 373-374; by Edward B. Ham in *MLN*, lxxix (1954), 217-220; by Mary Williams in *Fr. St.*, viii (1954), 158-159.

Vol. II and Vol. III, 1. Rev., together with Robert H. Ivy, Jr. (3342a), by Albert W. Thompson in *Speculum*, xxx (1955), 124-129.

3879. [Roques, Mario?]. [Report of Grail Colloquy at Strasbourg, March 29-April 3.] *Rom.*, lxxv (1954), 279-280.

3880. Rorimer, James J. "The Authenticity of the Chalice of Antioch." *Studies in Art and Literature for Belle da Costa Greene* (3856), pp. 161-168. (Rejects "Dr. Eisen's claim that the inner cup of the chalice is none other than the Holy Grail.")

3881. Rossi, Giuseppe Carlo. *Storia della letteratura portoghese*. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1953. (Arthurian romances, pp. 18-19.)

Rev. by Maria Rosa Lida de Malkiel in *Rom. Phil.*, viii (1954), 153-155; by a. m. in *Cultura Neolatina*, xiii (1953), 112.

3882. Russo, Luigi. "La letteratura cavalleresca dal 'Tristano' ai 'Reali di Francia.'" *Belfagor*, vi (1951), 40-59.

Brief notice by Gianfranco Folena in "Bibliografia degli studi sul '400 (1950-1953)," *GSLI*, cxxxi (1954), 287.

3883. de Sanctis, Francesco. *La poesia cavalleresca e scritti vari*. A cura di Mario Petrini. (Scrittori d'Italia, No. 212.) Bari: G. Laterza, 1954. (Lectures delivered in 1858-59. From Pulci and Ariosto to Gozzi.)

Brief notice (anon.) in *Belfagor*, ix (1954), 236.

1498. Saran, Franz. *Das Uebersetzen aus dem Mittelhochdeutschen*. 1930. Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage von Bert Nagel. 1953.

Rev. by Clair Baier in *MLR*, xlix (1954), 397; by Fernand Mossé in *Et. Germ.*, ix (1954), 180; by C. Soeteman in *Museum*, lxxix (1954), 96-97.

3884. Sauzin, M. "L'Humour de Wolfram von Eschenbach." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 109-110.

3561. Schröder, Walter Johannes. *Der dichterische Plan des Parzivalromans*. 1953.

Rev. by Hellmut Rosenfeld in *DLZ*, lxxv (1954), 757-762; by Heinz Rupp in *Archiv*, cxc (1954), 330-331. See also H. J. Weigand (3901).

3562. ————. *Der Ritter zwischen Welt und Gott*. 1952.  
Rev. by Irene Ott in *DAEM*, x (1953), 289-290. See also H. J. Weigand (3901).

3885. Schwietering, Julius. "Gottfried's *Tristan*." *GR*, xxix (1954), 5-17.

3886. ————. "The Origins of the Medieval Humility Formula." *PMLA*, lxix (1954), 1279-91. (Allusion to Chrétien, Hartmann, and Wolfram, p. 1286.)

3887. de Séchelles, D. *L'Origine du Graal*. Saint-Brieuc: Les Presses Bretonnes, 1954.

Rev. (together with Duval, *La Forêt de Breclien*, 3783), by C. Foulon in *Ann. de Bretagne*, lxi (1954), 209-211; by M. R. in *Rom.*, lxxv (1954), 430.

3168. Shaw, James E. *Guido Cavalcanti's Theory of Love*. 1949.  
Rev. by Guido Favati in *Studi Petrarqueschi*, iv (1951), 285-293; by Aldo Scaglioni in *Rom. Phil.*, vii (1953-54), 389-393; by Charles S. Singleton in *Speculum*, xxv (1950), 144-148.

3888. Siebert, Johannes. "Wolframs und Klingsors Stubenkrieg zu Eisenach." *Beiträge*, lxxv (1953), 365-390. (Belongs to Wartburgkrieg cycle. Only indirectly Arthurian.)

3889. Sisson, C. J. "Correspondence." *MLR*, xlix (1954), 355. (Concerning Jean Marx, *La Légende arthurienne et le Graal*, 3522.)

3890. Spitzer, Leo. "Explication de Texte Applied to Three Great Middle English Poems." *Archivum Linguisticum*, iii (1951), 1-22, 137-165. (Includes a parallel from Chrétien's *Yvain*.)

3891. Stammer, Wolfgang. *Kleine Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1953. (Allusions to Gottfried, Hartmann, and Wolfram.)

Rev. by W. T. H. Jackson in *MLQ*, xv (1954), 377-378; by Ernst Alfred Philippson in *JEGP*, lxxxiii (1954), 463-465; by Hellmut Rosenfeld in *ZDPh*, lxxxiii (1954), 332-333.

3892. ———— (ed.). *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß*. Band II. Berlin, Bielefeld, München: Erich Schmidt [1953-54]. (See 3657, 3808.)

3893. Starr, Nathan Comfort. *King Arthur Today: The Arthurian Legend in English and American Literature, 1901-1953*. Gainesville: Univ. of Florida Press, 1954.

Brief mention in *College English*, xvi (1954-55), 259.

3894. Steinberg, S. H. (ed.). *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of Literature*. 2 vols. London: Cassell, 1953. (See 3752, 3760, 3874, 3899, 3904.)

3895. Taylor, R. J. "The Musical Knowledge of the Middle High German Poet." *MLR*, xlix (1954), 331-338. (Includes discussion of Gottfried's use of musical terms in *Tristan*.)

Thiel, Joachim. See Wilhelm Kellermann (3823).

3410. Thomov, Thomas S. *Chrestomathie de la littérature française du moyen âge*. 1951.

Brief notice by Albert D. Menut in *Rom. Phil.*, VIII (1954), 65.

3896. Thorpe, Lewis. "Great Britain. Arthurian Bibliography 1953." *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 43-47.

3897. Townsend, Francis G. "Chaucer's Nameless Knight." *MLR*, XLIX (1954), 1-4. (On the *Wife of Bath's Tale*.)

Trask, Willard R. See Erich Auerbach (3596).

3898. Vinaver, Eugene. *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*. (Oxford Standard Authors.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

3899. ———. "Arthurian Legend." *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of Literature* (3894), I, 32-34.

3900. ———. "Le Roman de Balain et le Graal." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 105-106.

3729. Weber, Gottfried. *Gottfrieds von Strassburg "Tristan" und die Krise des hochmittelalterlichen Weltbildes um 1200*. 1953.

Rev. by Rainer Gruenter in *DLZ*, LXXV (1954), 267-283.

3421. Webster, Kenneth G. T., and Roger Sherman Loomis. *Ulrich von Zatzikhoven: Lanzelet*. 1951.

Rev. by George Fenwick Jones in *MLN*, LXIX (1954), 537-540.

3901. Weigand, Hermann J. "Trevrezent as Parzival's Rival?" *MLN*, LXIX (1954), 348-357. (Includes comment on Schröder, *Der dichterische Plan*, 3561, and *Der Ritter*, 3562.)

3902. ———. "Wolfram's Grail and the Neutral Angels: A Discussion and a Dialogue." *GR*, XXIX (1954), 83-95.

3903. White, Jon Manchip. "Tristan and Isolt." *History Today*, III (1953), 233-239.

3904. Whitehead, Frederick. "Bérout," I, 676; "Chrétien de Troyes," I, 774; "Marie de France," II, 1216; "Thomas d'Angleterre," II, 1553; "Wace, Robert," II, 1615-16. *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of Literature* (3894).

3905. ———. "La Crise morale dans le roman de Tristan." Abstract in *BBSIA*, 6 (1954), 99-100.

Whitesell, Frederick R. See Martin Joos (3116b).

3906. Wilkins, Ernest Hatch. *A History of Italian Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. (*Meliadus* and *Tristano ricciardiano*, p. 37; Boiardo, pp. 172-173; etc.)

3907. Willcock, Gladys D. "Middle English II: Before and After Chaucer." *YWES*, XXXIII, 1952 (1954), 67-87. (Geoffrey of Monmouth, Lawman, The Round Table, Malory, etc.)

3579a. Williams, Gwynn. *An Introduction to Welsh Poetry*. 1952.

Rev. by E. Bachellery in *Et. Angl.*, VII (1954), 134.

Wilson, R. M. See Bruce Dickins (3459).

3908. Woledge, Brian. *Bibliographie des romans et nouvelles en prose française antérieurs à 1500*. (Société de publications romanes et françaises, XLII.) Genève: Droz; Lille: Giard, 1954.

Rev. by A. Ewart in *Fr. St.*, IX (1955), 88-89.

3909. ———. "Arthurian Literature." *YWMLS*, XIII, 1951 (1952), 29-31, 35. (French.)

3910. Wolf, Werner. "Die Wundersäule in Wolframs Schastel marveile." *Öhmann Festschrift* (3869), pp. 275-314.

3586. ——— (ed.). *Albrecht von Scharfenberg* [sic]. *Der jüngere Titarel*. 1952.

Rev. by W. W. Chambers in *MLR*, XLIX (1954), 275-276; by G. De Smet in *Rev. Belge*, XXXII (1954), 919-920.

3911. Wolff, Ludwig (ed.). *Erbe der Vergangenheit*. 1951-53. (See *MLQ*, XIII [1952], 163; and xv [1954], 147. See also 3639, 3640.)

Rev. by Carl Selmer in *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 232-233. See also Peuckert (3872).

3912. Zeydel, Edwin H. "Wolfram von Eschenbach und *diu buoch*." *Euphoriion*, XLVIII (1954), 210-215.

Ziesemer, Walter. See Karl Helm (3340).

3913. Zumthor, Paul. *Histoire littéraire de la France médiévale (VI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954. (The legend of Tristan; Marie de France; Chrétien; pp. 193-197.)

Rev. by M. R. in *Rom.*, LXXV (1954), 286-287.

#### INDEX

Albrecht von Scharfenberg, 3808; *Der jüngere Titarel*, 3586 (Wolf).

*Alexandre l'Orphelin*, 3545 (Pickford).

American bibliography, 3743; literature, 3893.

Ariosto, 3883.

Arthur, 3748, 3754, 3766, 3769, 3773, 3829, 3893.

Arthurian bibliography, 3860, 3871; characters, 3794; Congress, 3474 (Frappier), 3787; legend, 3522 (Marx), 3850, 3889, 3893, 3899; names, 3434 (Ackerman); romance, 3802; scholars, 3862; Society, 3474 (Frappier), 3782.

Arthuriana, 3827.

Athelstan, 3837.

Auerbach, Erich, 3596, 3820.

Austrian bibliography, 3823; theses, 3822.

Balain, *Roman de*, 3900.

Ballads, 3802a.

*Barzas-Breis*, 3805.

Belgian bibliography, 3877.

Benoit, 3845.

Bérout, 3661 (Le Gentil), 3904.

Bibliography, 3743, 3756, 3775, 3781, 3789, 3793, 3797, 3823, 3827, 3829, 3848, 3860, 3862, 3870, 3871, 3877, 3896, 3908, 3909.

*Birth of Merlin*, 3778.

Blancheflor, 3867.

Boccaccio, 3845.

Brangien, 3788.

British bibliography, 3896.

Brocéliande, 3783.

Bruce, James D., 3840.

*Brut y Tywysogion*, 3819.

*Bulletin* (Arthurian Society), 3474 (Frappier).

Caliburn, 3843.

Canadian bibliography, 3743.

Cavalcanti, Guido, 3168 (Shaw), 3468 (Favati).

Cavalon, 3843.

Caw of Pritdin, 3769.

Celtic material and sources, 3769, 3809, 3860, 3864, 3865.

Chalice of Antioch, 3880.

*Chanson de Roland*, 3839.

*Chansons de geste*, 3814.

- Charlemagne, 3837.  
 Chaucer, *Wife of Bath's Tale*, 3845, 3897.  
 Chivalry, 3340 (Helm), 3550 (Richey), 3562 (Schröder), 3798.  
 Chrétien de Troyes, 3663 (Lejeune), 3802, 3807, 3812, 3886, 3904, 3913; *Cligès*, 3791; *Conte du Graal*, 3800, 3833, 3839; *Erec*, 3866, 3868; *Lancelot*, 3846; *Yvain*, 3791, 3890.  
*Chronicle of the Princes*, 3819.  
*Chroniques Gargantuaes*, 3796.  
 Congress, Arthurian, 3474 (Frappier), 3787.  
 Constantine, 3770.  
*Courrier arthurien*, 3474 (Frappier).  
 Courtly literature, 3605b (de Boer), 3752, 3882, 3883.  
 Courtly love, 3794.  
 Courtly reader, 3116b (Joos).  
  
*Didot Perceval*, 2419 (Roach).  
 Dissertations, 3862.  
 Dutch bibliography, 3781; literature, 3621a (Draak), 3780.  
  
 Early British history, 3765, 3766, 3767, 3768, 3770, 3771, 3773, 3818; languages, 3818.  
 Eilhart von Oberge, 3802.  
 English literature, 3876, 3890, 3893, 3907.  
 Enygeus, 3817.  
 Excalibur (or Escalibor), 3748, 3843.  
  
*Folie Tristan*, 1093 (Hæpfner), 3435 (Adler).  
 Folklore, 3746, 3748, 3779, 3788, 3811.  
 French bibliography, 3793; legends, 3851; literature, 3410 (Thomov), 3758, 3859, 3875, 3908, 3913; manuscripts, 3758, 3776; poetry, 3449 (Cohen); romance, 3812.  
  
 Gautier d'Arras, 3774.  
*Gawain and the Carle of Carlisle*, 3353 (Kurvinen), 3815.  
*Gawain and the Green Knight*, 3811, 3847, 3876.  
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, 3760, 3761, 3848, 3907; *History of the Kings of Britain*, 3339 (Hammer), 3762, 3763.  
 German bibliography, 3823, 3870; theses, 3822.  
 German literature, (Burger), 1498 (Saran), 2885 (Kosch), 3084 (Eis), 3340 (Helm), 3605b (de Boer), 3697 (Ranke), 3808, 3821, 3822, 3830, 3861, 3870, 3888, 3891, 3892, 3895; see also individual titles.  
 Gildas, 3765.  
 Gottfried von Strassburg, 2885 (Kosch), 3753, 3785, 3802, 3804, 3808, 3858, 3874, 3891; *Tristan*, 3729 (Weber), 3772, 3785, 3885, 3895.  
 Gozzi, 3883.  
 Grail, 3256 (Nelli), 3323a (Emmel), 3373 (Mergell), 3522 (Marx), 3798, 3827, 3829, 3841, 3850, 3852, 3853, 3857, 3864, 3880, 3889, 3900, 3902; Colloquy, 3832, 3879; romances, 3802.  
*Guingamor*, 3813.  
  
 Hammer, Jacob, 3848.  
 Hartmann von Aue, 3683 (Nagel), 3749, 3802, 3822, 3858, 3874, 3886, 3891; *Erec*, 3236 (van der Lee).  
 Hector, 3824.  
 Heinrich von Freiberg, 2885 (Kosch).  
 Heinrich von dem Türlin, 2885 (Kosch).  
 Herlekin, 3779.  
 Hispano-Arabic poetry, 2806 (Nykl).  
 Humility formula, 3886.  
 Humor, 3876.  
 Huon de Méry, 3517 (Lyons).  
  
 Irish analogies, 3764; bibliography, 3789; motif index, 3614 (Cross).  
 Iseult, 3750, 3788, 3903.  
 Italian bibliography, 3775; literature, 3468 (Favati), 3882, 3883, 3906.  
  
*Jaufré*, 3663 (Lejeune), 3878.  
  
 von Kurenberc, 3757.  
  
 Lais (lays), 3851.  
 Lance, bleeding, 3838, 3839.  
 Lancelot, 3792, 3840.  
*Lancelot*, prose, Dutch, 3780; French, 3799, 3824.  
*Lancelot en het Hert met de Witte Voet*, 3621a (Draak).  
 Lawman or Layamon, 2545 (Bögholm), 3754, 3760, 3907; *Brut*, 3811, 3876.  
 Loathly Lady, 3746.  
 Longinus, Lance of, 3837, 3838, 3839.  
  
*Mabinogion*, 3633 (Gruffydd).  
 Malory, Sir Thomas, 3760, 3873, 3898, 3907.  
 Manessier, 3342a (Ivy).  
 Manuscripts, French, 3758, 3776.  
 Marie de France, 3851, 3904, 3913.  
 Mauricius, St., Lance of, 3837.  
*Meliadus*, 3906.  
 Merlin, 2885 (Kosch), 3682 (Muschg).  
 Middle English texts, 3459 (Dickins).  
 Mimesis, 3596 (Auerbach), 3820.  
 Minnesang, 2885 (Kosch), 3794.  
 Minnesingers, 3627 (Frank).  
*Mirror of Love*, 3479 (Gunn), 3859.  
 Mons Badonicus, 3773.

- Morgante*, 3672 (Mariani), 3745.  
 Morris, William, 3777.  
*Mort Artu* (pseudo-Robert de Borron), 3755.  
*Mort le roi Artu, La*, 3801.  
*Morte Arthure*, alliterative, 3811, 3876.  
 Motif-Index, 3614 (Cross).  
 Musical terms, 3895.  
 Myrddin, 3346 (Jarman).  
 Names, Arthurian, 3434 (Ackerman).  
 Nennius, 3765.  
 Netherlands bibliography, 3781.  
 Niniane, 3809, 3863.  
 Oriflamme of France, 3838.  
 Other world, 3265 (Patch).  
 Pacolèt, 3779.  
 Pandragon, 3843.  
*Pantagruel*, 3796.  
 Parzival, 3901; see also Wolfram von Eschenbach.  
 Pauphilet, Albert, 3799.  
*Perceforest*, 3666 (Lods).  
 Perceval, 3867.  
*Perceval Continuations*, 3158 (Roach).  
 Percy's Folio Manuscript, 3803.  
 Percy's *Reliques*, 3802a.  
 Portuguese bibliography, 3756; literature, 3881.  
 Prose romances, 3875.  
 Provençal literature, 2806 (Nykl).  
 Pseudo-Robert de Borron, 3755.  
 Pulci, 3883.  
*Queste del Saint Graal*, 3517 (Lyons), 3835.  
*Real di Francia*, 3882.  
*Rhiannon*, 3633 (Gruffydd).  
 Robert de Blois, 3795.  
 Robert de Boron, *Joseph*, 3854; *Livre du Graal*, 3853; see also Pseudo-Robert de Borron.  
 Round Table, 3907.  
*Ryence's Challenge, King*, 3803.  
 Schulz, Albert ("San Marte"), 3806.  
 Scotland, Celtic, 3769.  
 Spanish bibliography, 3756.  
 Taliesin, 3346 (Jarman).  
 Thomas of Britain, 3661 (Le Gentil), 3904; *Tristan*, 3831.  
*Thomas of Erceldoune*, 3746, 3747.  
 Trevezent, 3901.  
 Tristan, 3531a (del Monte), 3661 (Le Gentil), 3744, 3764, 3827, 3834, 3849, 3882, 3903, 3913.  
*Tristan*, prose, 3776, 3836; roman de, 3905.  
*Tristano ricciardiano*, 3882, 3906.  
 Troubadours, 2806 (Nykl), 3790, 3834.  
 Trouvères, 3627 (Frank).  
 Ulrich von Türlheim, 3786, 3874.  
 Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, 3786, 3874; *Lanzelet*, 3421 (Webster).  
 Vergil, Polydore, 3485 (Hay).  
 Viviane, 3809, 3863.  
 Vortigern, 3767, 3771.  
 Wace, 3655 (Keller), 3754, 3761, 3904; *Brut*, 3763.  
 Wagner, Richard, 3842; *Tristan and Isolde*, 3750.  
 Wartburgkrieg cycle, 3888.  
 Welsh bibliography, 3860; literature, 3819; poetry, 3579a (Williams); tradition, 3759.  
*Wigamur*, 3828.  
 Wild men, 3600 (Bernheimer).  
 Wirnt von Grafenberg, 3786.  
 Wolfram von Eschenbach, 3502 (Lachmann), 3550 (Richey), 3682 (Muschg), 3751, 3784, 3808, 3810, 3816, 3821, 3822, 3825, 3852, 3857, 3858, 3874, 3884, 3886, 3888, 3891, 3902, 3910, 3912; *Parzival*, 3373 (Mergell), 3481 (Hartl), 3561 (Schröder), 3751, 3757, 3784, 3901, 3902.

## REVIEWS

*Aesthetics and Language*. Edited with an Introduction by WILLIAM ELTON. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. Pp. vi + 186. \$4.75.

More than thirty years have passed since I. A. Richards gave initial emphasis to a demand that men understand each other, take each other along, in their talk about aesthetic topics. The demand still exists, and the appearance of this volume suggests that it is still growing; but it is hardly pessimistic to observe that most aesthetic discussion still goes on among men who give no indication that they would consider the demand other than one more fad. Articles and even volumes multiply on every hand to which a critical reader may apply in vain with an insistent, "What are they talking about? Just words?"

During the eighteenth-century discussion of the nature of Beauty, Baumgarten's attempt to place Beauty in the area of feeling started much loose talk about Art with a capital A. It provided the then new word *aesthetic* with its deceiving semblance of a clear meaning. *Aesthetics and Language* reflects attempts to descend from the empyrean. It should be taken as an index of progress on the huge task, and no one should complain because it, or any other single volume, lacks the power to clear away all confusion. The slender volume contains a convenient reprint of some ten articles selected to "serve as models of analytical procedure in aesthetics." The editor expresses a wholesome "concern with fundamental linguistic confusions and freedom from the usual obfuscatory jargon." The intent is praiseworthy, and the volume should be useful. Contributors are drawn largely from those in sympathy with the point of view of what Professor Weitz has recently called the "Oxford Philosophy."

The "analytical philosophers," as represented by these essays, seem to deal analytically with language about aesthetics, not empirically with aesthetic matters themselves. Unlike many semanticists, who generally undertake to envisage the findings of related disciplines as part of an empirical approach, one may find here, for example, Professor Gilbert Ryle, in "Feelings," dealing with the topic for nearly twenty pages without ever once indicating an acquaintance with the important discoveries of the last century on the physiological bases of conative and affective responses. Empiricists the contributors to this volume wish to be, but they strike one as philosophers of empiricism skilled in the careful handling of symbols, never as scientists who turn to experience at each step to check their conclusions.

Not a competent or licensed philosopher, this reviewer may unwittingly succumb to the very human tendency to think too slightly of things he does not closely understand. It seems that when these analytical philosophers deal with aesthetic theory, they look cautiously to the validity of their language but casually to the experiences talked about. They point out many pitfalls of aesthetic theory and deal a bit too solemnly perhaps with the process of slaying a concept which a trained semanticist would drop with two words, "No referent."

Cogency, sanity, and usefulness in discussions of aesthetics must come, it would seem, from minds that somehow manage to envisage many of the pertinent experiences, those of the creative artists, those of the spectators, those of the psychologists, those of the linguists, those of the axiologists, etc. Such experiences need to be synthesized by eclectic minds policed by experts in symbolic logic. *Aesthetics and Language* provides some salutary police action.

JOHN WILCOX

Wayne University



*Cambridge Middle English Lyrics.* Edited by HENRY A. PERSON. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1953. Pp. viii + 92. \$2.50.

This edition consists of seventy pieces of Middle English verse collected from manuscripts in the libraries of several of the colleges of Cambridge University. Sixty are printed here for the first time, though variants of some have appeared before; the remaining ten are included to call attention to problems not handled by earlier editors. Professor Person worked from photostatic copies of twenty-six manuscripts; most of these are fifteenth-century commonplace books, though his collection includes verse written as early as the thirteenth century and as late as the sixteenth. The spelling and punctuation of the manuscripts are reproduced and scribal markings are transcribed with unusual fullness.

New texts are always welcome for the light they cast on the interests, techniques, and figurative modes of medieval poetry, and this slender miscellany contains some interesting and useful pieces. Any estimate of the relative value of individual items, and indeed of the collection as a whole, will depend on the special interests of the reader. No. 3, "An ABC Poem on the Passion," includes a genuinely lyric digression on the Blessed Virgin which makes it a valuable addition to the type. The Latin text and English rendering of "Cur Mundus Militat," Nos. 14-15, supply useful material for the study of this popular version of the *ubi sunt* theme. No. 53, "Alas, quid eligam ignoro," is the longest poem in the collection and, in my judgment, the most interesting. In it a young Master of Arts and a young man of the world each recount the advantages and disabilities of the vocations open to them. The problem of choice is resolved by appeals to the experience of Susanna, Griselda, and Constance and determination to rely on grace and trust in the divine will. This poem, along with Nos. 46, 56, and 59, is hardly secular, as Professor Person classifies it, and might have been included among Instructive Pieces.

There is, however, much in the collection that seems to me of doubtful value. The excellent general anthologies of Brown, Robbins, and Greene have made conveniently available an extensive selection of representative Middle English verse. With so much late verse still unpublished, new collections based on more clearly defined and limited purposes would, I think, provide us with more useful texts. Similarly vague principles of selection underlie the notes and bibliography of this volume, though there is much of value in both.

RICHARD H. GREEN

Princeton University

*That Grand Whig Milton.* By GEORGE F. SENSABAUGH. Stanford: Stanford University Publications, University Series, Language and Literature, Vol. XI; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1952. Pp. ix + 213. \$4.00.

In his preface to this excellent book Professor Sensabaugh writes: "The legend of Milton the statesman . . . still whets curiosity; and if it now seems fairly certain that during his own time Milton failed to achieve the stature often attributed to him, this hardly precludes the possibility that he might have become, as sometimes suggested, a significant figure later in the seventeenth century, when Whig principles of government triumphed in Englishmen's minds. Effectiveness in political disputes at this time would, in a sense, give him a

greater claim to true statesmanship than would influence during the Puritan rebellion inasmuch as the Commonwealth withered for lack of support, whereas Whig theories of government, ratified in the Revolutionary settlement and in the Bill of Rights, still lie at the basis of English society and indeed animate free men everywhere in the Western world" (p. vii).

Professor Sensabaugh abundantly shows that Milton in the last forty years of the seventeenth century did come to be regarded as a true statesman. It is the purpose of the book to show just how this change occurred. In five chapters entitled "A Revolutionary Program," "Royalist Reaction," "The Attempted Whig Revolution," "The Revolutionary Settlement," and "Whig Theory Triumphant," Milton's political ideas are expounded and their fortunes traced. And we can say that Milton, neglected, ridiculed, or attacked in his own lifetime, became an influential figure in the late seventeenth century first by republication of his political works, especially *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, *Defense of the English People*, *Areopagitica*, and *Eikonoklastes*. Again, he came into his own by adaptations and paraphrases of these works. Finally, the opposition to his ideas by royalists or, as they came later to be called, Tories, who conferred on Milton the epithet (see p. 110) which Professor Sensabaugh has used as the title of his book, operated to encourage Milton's followers to agree that it was from him that most of their ideas came.

The word *Whig* does not come into the index of this book. This is not because the author is steering clear of giving a definition of the Whig position. Professor Sensabaugh certainly would not subscribe to Dr. Samuel Johnson's remark in 1763 that "Whiggism is a negation of all principle" (Boswell's *Johnson*, Temple Classics edition, II, 115). For throughout the book here reviewed, the Whigs are said to have two main principles: freedom of belief (inside the frame of Protestantism) and the social contract theory of the origin of government. Many Whig pamphleteers are cited in this connection, and for one of them I noted a small error. One John Harrington (see p. 44) is mentioned, and I assume that this is the author of *The Oceana* (1656). The writer of this influential work, however, was James Harrington (1611-1677).

The Whig principles cited by Professor Sensabaugh were not those, however, which were most discussed at the time when the Whig and Tory parties were organized and received their names. (See William, first Earl Cowper, in his work *An Impartial History of Parties*, 1714). The points in controversy between Whigs and Tories in the period mentioned immediately above (1678-1683) were (1) the royal prerogatives and (2) the position of the Established Church. Tories held that the first must be maintained even at the expense of the second, while the Whigs turned the order exactly around.

Milton himself does not define for us his version of the social contract theory, though he clearly adheres to such a theory. Several views of it were held in seventeenth-century England; the most complete prior to the Revolution of 1688 was that of Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). But Hobbes was repudiated by both Whigs and Tories: by the Whigs, because he maintained, as they mistakenly assumed, the doctrine of absolute monarchy; by the Tories, because he did not believe in the divine right of kings. It was John Locke (1632-1704) who, after the Revolution of 1688 and in defense of it, expounded the most complete Whig version of the theory and one which has striking parallels with that implied in Milton's writings.

Professor Sensabaugh gives somewhat too much attention to the theoretic phase of Whiggism. It was not the theories of the Whigs but their practical

politics which lost them their objects in the Popish Plot agitation. And it was not their theories but their practical politics and the help of the Tories which made the Revolution of 1688 a success.

ALLEN R. BENHAM

University of Washington

*Emerson and Greenough: Transcendental Pioneers of an American Esthetic.* By CHARLES R. METZGER. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954. Pp. 153. \$3.00.

This little book offers a closely reasoned analysis and interpretation of the aesthetic ideas of Ralph Waldo Emerson and his friend Horatio Greenough, the sculptor. As philosophical criticism it is thoughtful, original, and sometimes brilliant. But it is also abstract, difficult, and sometimes obscure. The reader interested in the history and logical interrelations of ideas will find here a rich mine of interpretation and suggestion. But the title is somewhat misleading—"Emerson and Greenough" are not really the subjects, but only those ideas about art which the two held in common.

Taking his start from the late F. O. Matthiessen's discussion of "The Organic Principle" in *The American Renaissance*, Dr. Metzger develops an interpretation of Emerson's philosophy of art in terms of the ideas of "the organic" and "the functional" which have come to dominate our modern architectural theory. The second part of his book then shows how Horatio Greenough treated these same ideas with a greater clarity and concreteness, long before most other artists had accepted or even heard of them. This comparative treatment helps to make clear many of Emerson's ideas which have seemed vague and over-abstract, and to emphasize the prophetic modernism of Greenough's thought.

The faults of the book result almost entirely from its method—that of pure philosophical analysis. It begins with abstraction and works very slowly toward more concrete illustration. To complicate matters, it omits the usual table of contents, which might help the reader by offering signposts. The first chapter (on Emerson) discusses the protestant, religious inspiration of his aesthetic ideas—that is to say, their most abstract and general qualities. Although this discussion is both sound and fresh, it seems to float in a vacuum. Only in the second half of the book, which analyzes Emerson's ideas on architecture (obviously a more concrete subject) and illustrates them from Greenough's writing, does this abstraction come down from the clouds.

The last (and longest) chapter, however, gives rich justification for the slow, earlier approach. Describing the new philosophy as a "Unitarian Esthetic," Dr. Metzger suggests how the religious and the philosophic merged to produce our modern concept of art and architecture. Religious Unitarianism viewed the world as one unity, and the religious and the secular as interrelated in the same way that the beautiful and the useful are interrelated. Modern functionalism, which refuses to divorce the beautiful form from the useful function, has thus resulted directly and logically from the Unitarian faith which nurtured both Emerson and Greenough a century and a half ago.

FREDERIC I. CARPENTER

University of California

*Linguistic Bibliography for the Year 1952 and Supplement for Previous Years.*

Published by the Permanent International Committee of Linguists, with a grant from the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization. Utrecht-Anvers: Spectrum, 1954. Pp. xxxi + 297.

This is the seventh volume in a current bibliography of linguistics published under the sponsorship of UNESCO and covering the years 1939-1952. The present issue contains about 6,000 entries, including individual works as well as articles found in more than 500 periodicals. Although some attempt is made to include reviews, a total coverage is impossible because of the understandably long delay in the appearance of some reviews. A good many entries, moreover, are recorded much later than their published dates; whether they have been delayed in the press or lost in the handling, it is hard to know.

The compilation is made by an international committee of linguists and, as such, deserves the highest praise. It is not only an indispensable guide for linguists, few of whom will see or read more than a small fraction of the items listed, but also for libraries throughout the world. Like mathematics, linguistics is a discipline with both intrinsic and extrinsic value to all people and all cultures, and is therefore of almost universal interest.

On the matter of completeness, the authors (mostly anonymous) are to be congratulated for their broad choice of material; even the most marginal references are included. We must also admire the neat arrangement and meticulous editing: the number of misprints is exceedingly small and their nature insignificant.

The only criticism the reviewer wishes to make is one regarding the numbering of pages on the bound side. The language or topic appears on the outside of the page, where it has no practical use, since the outline of contents alone can serve adequately in the finding of particular language groups. In this connection, it would seem that an index of languages involved would be a valuable addition to the work. On the whole, however, no scholarship will be impeded by small inconveniences, and we can look forward to the continued appearance of this useful bibliography.

CARROLL E. REED

*University of Washington*

*The German Sturm und Drang.* By ROY PASCAL. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. Pp. xvi + 347. \$4.75.

As members of *Sturm und Drang*, Professor Pascal includes only Merck, Herder, Goethe, Lenz, and Klinger. Maler Müller, H. L. Wagner, and Leisewitz are listed as "peripheral and dependent figures"; "some, like Klopstock, Justus Möser, or Gerstenberg" are ranked as precursors in certain ways; Schiller is set off by himself as one who differs in several essential aspects from the other *Stürmer und Dränger*; and Jung-Stilling, Fritz Jacobi, Heinse, Lavater, and some of the *Hainbund* are presented as "temporary and partial associates" who diverge from the movement at its most critical points. Thumb-nail biographical sketches of the "personalities" (Chapter I) of *Sturm und Drang*, however, add Hamann and include Schiller within the central group listed above. Pascal sums up their common element as a belief in the primacy of feeling and intuition, a desire for intense life and personal significance, and a revolt against

the security of dogma (rather overemphasizing the influence of pietism in these personal instances).

Pascal covers a huge amount of territory and falls into remarkably few factual errors; e.g., Leuchsenring is ridiculed in *Pater Brey* rather than the *Jahrmarktsfest*, and *Egmont* was completed in Italy rather than in Weimar. His attitude toward the whole problem of the unmarried mother in this period might also have been considerably enlightened by Oscar W. Werner's dissertation (1917!) on this subject.

Practically all of the book is a series of studies of the attitude of Stürmer and Dränger toward various items: e.g., "The State" (headed by Leisewitz' "Der Staat tötet die Freiheit"), which naturally they would dislike in its more organized stages while admiring even political great men; "Social Classes," which, despite or due to a welter of material, leads to few conclusions except that the *Volk* and lower middle-class girls are quite generally portrayed sympathetically, but if they expressed the first "modern revolt against class society," the author has not demonstrated it satisfactorily; "Religion," which they obviously approach in a non-dogmatic manner on the basis of feeling; "The Creative Personality," which presents the ideal of the group for dynamic self-realization of the total personality and capacity of the individual—especially the "genius"—and its impatience with the restrictions of the social order; "Thought and Reality" is broken down into three subchapters on "Language & Consciousness" which is restricted to Herder's views on the origin of language and Hamann's reaction to them, "Mind & Matter" which is also largely limited to Herder's ideas on the subjects, and "Mother Nature" which quite naturally is devoted almost entirely to Goethe, showing his development from a feeling of identity with nature to his later more detached attitude; and "The Idea of History," which is again restricted to Herder with his historical relativism and search for the spirit of each culture he discusses, coupled with a Lessing-like belief that Providence inscrutably guides the historical process, while for modern civilization Herder has only a complete, irrational, Rousseauistic aversion.

Chapter VIII, "The Revolution in Poetics," naturally interests us most, and is the longest chapter in the book (pp. 233-99). After a short general statement, it is again split into subchapters: "The Subjective Revolt" shows the anti-rational aspect with its emphasis on the "original genius" or, as Lenz put it, "re-creative creation," which Mr. Pascal rightly views as the "formula for the rejection of conventional standards, but also the basis for a new method of literary criticism and a new principle of poetry." On the other hand, "The Search for Objective Principles of Criticism" opens with Herder's struggle to arrive at increasingly objective conclusions as to the nature of language, poetry, and drama (Pascal frankly states that Herder is still often rhapsodic—and hence subjective, we might add), but the only common denominator of the rest of this section seems to be that Sturm und Drang "insisted that poetry is not an abstract self-contained activity, but a function of living individuals in a concrete situation" (p. 268) and that artistic form, or formlessness, is a function of the culture from which it arises. Möser's essay of 1781, in which he speaks of both the realism and subjectivism of Storm and Stress, leads Pascal into his next subchapter, "Imagination and Reality." This is surely one of the major achievements of the new movement: That some of its members, at least on occasion, synthesize the previous dichotomy of imaginative experience and reality, and use imagination not to escape or beautify reality, but as a means of seeing reality whole and giving it poetic form. Pascal has done a fine job

of pointing this up and relating it specifically to Merck, Herder, Goethe, and Lenz. The section on "Poetic Form," among other things, states that the Stürmer und Dränger felt uneasy about such relatively clear terms as "tragedy" (p. 282), to which might be added: "And well they might, if only to escape the confines into which tragedy had been poured," or one might also equate their use of the term *Schauspiel* to Diderot's *drame*. "The Function of Poetry" is completely changed, largely from an intellectual occupation to a subjective necessity, *Erlebnisdichtung*, recreating reality into truth and art rather than making nature into a representation of conventional morality.

In the final chapter, "The Achievement," Pascal admits that the Storm and Stress "mode of apprehension of life was so new . . . that its rational expression was extremely difficult; while in imaginative works . . . they were able to grasp their situation and their problem most adequately" (p. 310). For exactly this reason, we look forward to Pascal's promised volume which is to contain an analysis of the literary works of this movement, and should be even more revealing than the present largely theoretical work.

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

University of Washington

*The Esthetic Intent of Tieck's Fantastic Comedy.* By RAYMOND M. IMMERWAHR. Saint Louis: Washington University Studies, New Series, Language and Literature, No. 22, 1953. Pp. ix + 150. \$3.50.

This interesting and well-reasoned study rejects that time-honored tradition of German history which asserts that Tieck's fantastic comedies, such as *Der gestiefelte Kater*, are associated with Friedrich Schlegel's concept of romantic irony because of the author's use of the destruction of illusion. It is Professor Immerwahr's intention in this study rather "to view Tieck's fantastic farces from the perspective of comedy, and to this end it will employ principles of comedy enunciated by Friedrich and August Wilhelm Schlegel, implicit in Tieck's general criticism, and explicitly applied by all three to the plays in question" (p. 1). After presenting the views on irony expressed by various critics from Hettner to Walzel, Immerwahr continues with a close analysis of Friedrich Schlegel's conception of Aristophanic comedy. While the latter failed to appreciate Aristophanes' essential truthfulness and universality, the theatrical values of the Old Comedy, and the import of his satire, he made an important aesthetic discovery: the supreme value of the Aristophanic creation as comedy; and his essay, "Vom ästhetischen Werthe der griechischen Komödie," marks a turning point in Aristophanic criticism for all Europe (pp. 25, 113). "It is the first attempt of European criticism," writes Immerwahr, "to evaluate Aristophanic drama as comedy and to establish the esthetic legitimacy of fantastic comedy in general" (p. 113). This, to be sure, was true mainly of his classical period. He rejected this ideal the further he moved in the direction of Romanticism, favoring the romantic comedy he found in Shakespeare and Calderon to that of Aristophanes. As is shown in the following chapter, A. W. Schlegel tried, somewhat unconvincingly, to make room for both these literary ideals, but showed his romantic prejudice in condemning the French and German realistic middle-class comedy.

Immerwahr's analysis of Tieck's work as a writer of fantastic comedy shows



that there were certain tendencies toward fantastic comedy already in such early works as *Blaubart*, more clearly in *Hanswurst als Emigrant*, and reaching its climax in *Der gestiefelte Kater*. The principal fantastic-comic theme of this play is the logical anomaly in our having to regard an individual character or scene as a general institution, or the identification of character and actor, action and play, locale and stage-set. This, as Immerwahr correctly says, is "not so much 'destroyed illusion' as a *forced confusion* of entities which ought rationally to be kept apart" (p. 56). In answer to the condemnation by Tieck's critics of its lack of dramatic interest and unity which they ascribe to its destruction of theatrical illusion, Immerwahr states that if we judge *Der gestiefelte Kater* as fantastic comedy, according to the principles expressed by the Schlegels, the absence of dramatic unity appears as an inevitable expression of the prevailing comic mood (p. 61). "The annihilation of theatrical illusion does not 'destroy the poet's own creation'—the charge frequently leveled against *Der gestiefelte Kater*—for such a creation is intended to be no more than a fabric of jesting whimsy" (pp. 58-59).

Tieck's second fantastic comedy *Die verkehrte Welt* is "at once a much bolder and a much less successful venture into the comic and satiric territories explored by the first one" (p. 62), whereas his third full-length comedy, *Prinz Zerbino*, does not even aspire toward aesthetic unity but illustrates rather a striving for Friedrich Schlegel's tenet of "progressive Universalpoesie" (p. 68). *Das Ungeheuer und der verzauberte Wald*, a work contemporary with *Die verkehrte Welt* and *Zerbino*, attains a greater measure of artistic unity than either, but it is a different modification of fantastic comedy: an operative adaptation of the comic technique peculiar to Gozzi, where the fantastic serves as a foil to ludicrous figures derived from the everyday world (p. 71). A later comedy, *Anti-Faust*, is an obvious emulation of Aristophanic comedy but is marred by relapses into tedious intellectualism and verbosity (p. 74). Most of Tieck's later ventures in comedy, such as *Kaiser Octavianus*, *Rotkäppchen*, and *Däumchen*, exhibit the tendency to realism. The first, a studied exercise in what the romanticists themselves understood by romantic comedy, stands apart from the concept of fantastic jest (p. 114). The latter two comedies, best represented by *Rotkäppchen*, strive for "the special comic effect inherent in a realistic treatment of fantastic material" (p. 76).

*Der gestiefelte Kater* and *Die verkehrte Welt* preserve the Schlegels' demand for irrationality and the mockery of theatrical illusion in comic caprice but fall far short of their comic ideals in the range of materials covered by their jest and satire. "The world which they ridicule is not the whole, vital universe of human folly and animality which the Schlegels rightly credited to Aristophanes, but a petty theatrical, belletristic milieu with trivial, ephemeral foibles" (p. 79). Measured against Aristophanes as a comic poet, Tieck is scarcely better than a satirist. Moreover, Tieck lacks Aristophanes' comic inventiveness and shows his limitations in his monotonous development of a single one of the countless motives developed by Aristophanes, the incongruity of theatrical representation (pp. 82 f., 114).

Immerwahr then deals with Tieck's own aesthetic thought in so far as it bears on our problem, focusing particularly on his second romantic period and on those later critical utterances which continue in the romantic vein. Tieck agrees with the conception of the Schlegels and that of Romanticism in general concerning the indissoluble relation of jest and earnestness but rules out didacticism or calculated "tear-jerking" as having no place in poetic art. He also



agrees with them as to the incompatibility of jest with rational order, thus opening the way for Aristophanic "intoxication of fantasy" (p. 89). He regards his satire and his upsetting of theatrical illusion—two characteristics which have monopolized the attention of Tieck's critics, and which constitute the two most striking hallmarks of Tieck's fantastic comedy—"as inevitable manifestations of the pervading spirit of light, jesting play" (pp. 90-91). An important consideration is that to Tieck *Ironie* is something quite different from the destruction of illusion. While the spirit of *Ironie* may be found in some of Tieck's earlier writings, he did not become fully conscious of it ideologically until much later. Tieck's later utterances identify the fundamental concepts of Solger and Friedrich Schlegel without accepting the more frivolous inferences sometimes drawn by the latter. They have, however, nothing to do with the destruction of theatrical illusion, for, in Tieck's view, irony is primarily represented by characters. This may be seen in Quixote who strives to attain the noblest objectives through the most ludicrous methods (pp. 92 f.).

The mutual reactions and influence of the Schlegels and Tieck are discussed in the final chapter. The most paradoxical outcome of his inquiry, according to Immerwahr, is that the one work by Tieck which comes closest to the Schlegels' conception of pure comedy, *Der gestiefelte Kater*, cannot have been influenced by their theory, since it was published before he met them. Following the same paradoxical pattern, his comedies written with an increasing likelihood of influence by the Schlegels are progressively removed from their concept of pure comedy. While the Schlegels undoubtedly stimulated Tieck's interest in Aristophanes, Tieck lost the power to express nonsensical mirth, and the Schlegels in turn were moving away from their concept of Aristophanic comedy and directing him toward their new ideal of "progressive Universalpoesie." Hence Friedrich Schlegel's warm approval of the romantic comedy *Kaiser Octavianus* and their coolness to *Der gestiefelte Kater* after an initial warm approval of it by August Wilhelm (pp. 103 f.).

In his conclusion Immerwahr correctly points out the difference between Friedrich Schlegel's concept of irony and the atmosphere permeating fantastic comedy as being two different reactions to the fundamental situation in which the romanticist finds himself. Basing his conclusion on Maurice Boucher, Immerwahr sees in "the ironic smile" the romanticist's defense against frustration at his inability to attain the Absolute. The corollary to this, according to Immerwahr, is a release from "despair in the wanton play of intoxicated comic fantasy" (p. 116).

Immerwahr has in this study effectively dispelled the confusion arising from the traditional misconception of Tieck's *Der gestiefelte Kater* as an illustration of romantic irony and has given the genre of fantastic comedy in Tieck its proper meaning and perspective.

PERCY MATENKO

Brooklyn College

*Rilke's Craftsmanship: An Analysis of His Poetic Style.* By H. W. BELMORE.  
Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Modern Language Studies, 1954. Pp. x + 234. 25s.

The volume of Rilke scholarship which, according to Walter Ritzer, towers over the poet's Orphic work like a mountain range, has grown considerably in the last few years. In addition to works by such well-known Rilke scholars as

Romano Guardini, H. E. Holthusen, J. B. Leishman, and Edmond Jaloux there have been quite a number of books by authors new to the field. Dr. Erich Simenauer's detailed psychoanalytical study *Rainer Maria Rilke: Legende und Mythos* (1953) is a case in point; so is Peter Demetz's interesting account of Rilke's youthful indiscretions: *René Rülkes Prager Jahre* (1953). The author of *Rilke's Craftsmanship* is also a newcomer. This may account for a tendency to exaggerate, noticeable in many books on Rilke, but particularly in those written by youthful admirers.

The theme of Belmore's book is Rilke as a "master of form." He is right in saying that this is one aspect of the Rilke problem that has not received the attention it deserves, although it would be incorrect to assume that it had been neglected entirely. Holthusen's book on the *Sonnets to Orpheus* contains a detailed style analysis, and Ernest Rose and David I. Masson have closely analyzed individual Rilke poems. Their conclusions are similar to Belmore's. Still, it is impressive to see how much evidence can be marshaled in defense of the thesis that no poet before Rilke "had employed and mastered such a wealth of poetic devices to such effect, none had attended with such care to the art of poetry" (p. 221). The book leaves no doubt that for Belmore Rilke is the poet and has no peer, unless it be G. M. Hopkins.

In chapters of unequal length and unequal merit—this reviewer liked best the chapters on "Vowel Sounds" and "Syntax"—the whole range of Rilke's poetic technique is reviewed: his verse forms, his rhymes and rhythms, the tempo and volume of his poetry (admittedly controversial subjects), his word order, his language, his metaphors and similes. In the last fifty pages an attempt is made to show the development and growth of Rilke's style from *Early Poems* to *Letzte Gedichte*.

This part seemed to me the least successful of the book. Not that I disagree with many of Mr. Belmore's findings. Generally speaking what he says is true enough: the growth of Rilke's style from those early, preciously neo-romantic poems of his youth to the condensed beauty of the *Sonnets to Orpheus* is remarkable; that is one of the few things about which most Rilke scholars are agreed. I regret what Mr. Belmore does not say. To start with the most glaring omission: Mr. Belmore nowhere mentions Rilke's French poems. I know of course that an analysis of Rilke's style does not have to take note of every poem or poetic cycle he wrote and that many scholars tend to dismiss Rilke's French poems as literary curiosities. I hold the opposite view because (a) Rilke's French poems have been hailed by French critics as significant original creations; and (b) an artist's style transcends his medium of expression: *le style est l'homme même*. A comprehensive analysis of Rilke's style, particularly in the very last phase, i.e., after the *Sonnets to Orpheus*, cannot be made, I contend, without taking his French poems into account. If this were done, it might be found that Rilke's style developed beyond the *Sonnets to Orpheus*. In this connection it is particularly unfortunate that the last group of poems Mr. Belmore considers is *Letzte Gedichte*. This arbitrarily compiled collection of "ruins & relics" written at various stages of Rilke's life is the worst possible text on which to base a scholarly investigation. A much better book would have been the volume entitled *Gedichte 1906 bis 1926*, edited by Dr. Ernst Zinn (1953).

There are a number of minor points which could be raised against the book; e.g., when Mr. Belmore says "never is there the least trace of strain in Rilke's elaborate art of rhyming" (p. 18), he certainly exaggerates. Indeed, he himself

points out on the same page that in the *Stundenbuch* rhyme "sometimes becomes tiresome and obtrusive." Similarly, he overshoots the mark when he asserts that in the whole collection of *Neue Gedichte* "there is not a flat or lifeless passage" (p. 202). Again, he himself notes traces of mannerisms in *Neue Gedichte*. In reading Belmore's interesting book I felt again and again that he left himself open to the charge of vagueness. What point is there in such statements as: "In many instances, rhyme and rhythm combine to give life to a stanza" (p. 30); "In his central period, nouns and verbs are the main features of Rilke's diction" (p. 127 f.); "Sometimes Rilke couples his adjectives for emphasis" (p. 144). Broad generalizations of this sort stand in marked contrast to the precision of Rilke's art.

Paradoxically, it is the great merit of Belmore's book that he emphasizes Rilke's craftsmanship, pointing out that a poem by the mature Rilke is a precision-built instrument. The critic who wants to take it apart successfully must have, in addition to admiration and reverence, an incisive mind (*heilig-nüchtern*) and a controlled style.

H. F. PETERS

Reed College

*Führer zu Gotthelf und Gotthelfstätten: Auf Anregung des Berner Schriftstellervereins mit Unterstützung der Bernischen Erziehungsdirektion. Herausgegeben von WALTER LAEDRACH. Bern: A. Francke Verlag, 1954. Pp. 167. Sfr. 5.60.*

This book is a chrestomathy in the best tradition of the concept—a collection of writings useful for learning. In six essays by various authors the reader is presented with competent discussions of Gotthelf's life and personality, his art, theology, and politics, and is finally led to the historical sites commemorating phases of his life or art. For the purpose of additional illustration, a number of photographs and, what is probably more important to the student, a selected bibliography of Gotthelf editions and criticism are appended to the book. All of the contributors are known for their earlier work on Gotthelf, particularly Kurt Guggisberg and Werner Jucker, the editors of the nine supplement volumes to the great Hunziker-Bloesch edition of Jeremias Gotthelf's *Sämtliche Werke* (24 vols.; Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rensch Verlag, 1921 ff.). But the others, Werner Kohlschmidt, Paul Marti, Fritz Huber-Renfer, and Walter Laedrach, the editor of the collection, are also familiar to the Gotthelf scholar.

The title of the collected essays, modest as it is, can nevertheless claim for itself the virtue of only arousing such expectations as are later fully satisfied by the contents. Many books on Gotthelf, some of the basic studies not excluded, estrange and alienate the student from his subject by distorting the great writer's features into mythical and prophetic dimensions which are completely out of keeping with their simplicity. Unlike those cramped attempts, this Gotthelf book is a true introduction to Gotthelf by virtue of its realism and its stress upon the human rather than the historical element in his spiritual make-up. This can be said particularly of Werner Jucker's introductory essay, "Leben und Persönlichkeit Jeremias Gotthelfs," where one finds such a lively portrait of the gifted but recalcitrant country parson that one must of necessity feel humanly close to him in spite of, or perhaps precisely on account of, his numerous weaknesses which are so disarmingly admitted by this biographer. The value of the sketch is further enhanced by the fact that its expert author, with all due respect for

his pioneering forerunners, courageously challenges certain misconceptions in the interpretation of decisive traits of Gotthelf's philosophy and politics; e.g., the futile and somewhat disgusting attempt to turn Gotthelf's obviously stubborn and reactionary attitude toward political and social developments in his native country and elsewhere into a great prophetic vision of the doom and downfall of Western civilization as a whole.

In summary, the volume, in spite of its intended popular appeal, will be profitable even to the initiated Gotthelf scholar, not so much perhaps because of any striking newness inherent in it, but because of the common sense, the soundness, and the lucidity displayed by its authors. It may very well help restore the image of a living Gotthelf which has been obscured and clouded by too much incense of the wrong kind.

EGON SCHWARZ

Harvard University

*Der Briefwechsel Arthur Schnitzler-Otto Brahm.* Edited by OSKAR SEIDLIN. Berlin: Selbstverlag der Gesellschaft für Theatergeschichte, Band 57, 1953. Pp. 266.

With this admirable edition Professor Seidlin has made an important contribution to modern literary history. In the 215 letters he has selected from the 424 surviving items of the Schnitzler-Brahm correspondence, both the dramatist and the director emerge as characters "in the round."

Brahm appears as a frank, though tactful, critic of the dramas Schnitzler submitted for production under his aegis: "lieber will ich Sie durch Reden verstimmen als durch Schweigen schädigen" (p. 106). He is quick to ask for more careful motivation or to suggest cuts, always giving concrete reasons; Schnitzler, of course, is moved at times to protest. Usually good-humored, Brahm can be firm, and at one point (pp. 159 ff.) applies very direct pressure. His jealousy of Reinhardt is evident. Schnitzler seems a much more complicated human being: beneath his Viennese smoothness of manner, one sees both a poet plagued by self-doubt and a keen businessman. More interesting than his occasional complaints that certain of his pieces are not performed more often are the passages of self-criticism: thus his reference (p. 157) to his "predominantly epic talent." Taken as a whole, the correspondence is evidence of a relationship which does honor to both its participants.

In more than 300 succinct notes, Professor Seidlin elucidates innumerable details. Time after time, he explains references to Schnitzler's dramas and to other contemporary works and to scores, if not hundreds, of the actors involved. The editor gives generous credit to his "informants," Henry Schnitzler and Paul Marx, the latter formerly a member of Brahm's ensemble.

The introduction combines a warm tribute to Brahm with an incisive study of Schnitzler's fundamentally melancholy "world."

HENRY HATFIELD

Harvard University

*Ronsard poète de l'amour. Livre II: De Marie à Genève.* Par FERNAND DESONAY. Bruxelles: Palais des Académies, 1954. Pp. 320.

In his study of *Ronsard poète de l'amour* during the period 1555-1563, M. Desonay has achieved results no less startling than those revealed in his volume

on the *Amours de Cassandre*. With a mass of evidence which appears to be invulnerable, he has reached two conclusions which are in almost complete disagreement with the observations of previous students of Ronsard: he has found that the element of carnal love is much stronger in the *Amours de Cassandre*; that Ronsard is almost timid in the *Amours de Marie*. And he has demonstrated that in seven cases out of nine Ronsard's corrections harm rather than improve the quality of his lyricism.

M. Desonay accomplishes these results by the use of a method which inspires complete confidence. He does not ignore the contribution of the literary historians, and he shows a thorough familiarity with Ronsard studies published both in France and abroad. But he stands apart from earlier students of Ronsard in the emphasis which he places upon the meticulous examination of the text itself.

After a few brilliant pages on Bourgueil and Ronsard's home in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel, pages which bring to life the site of Ronsard's amorous adventures during this period, he examines the themes of the *Continuations des Amours*. He finds the Marie of tradition, a simple peasant girl of fifteen, who was supposed to offer the poet amorous consolation for the coldness of Cassandre, quite different from the girl actually portrayed by Ronsard. He finds the rustic element much slighter than others had thought it to be. He is careful not to reveal the findings of M. Henri Longnon concerning the identity of Marie, except to imply that she is of Provençal nobility. His most important discovery in this chapter has to do with the erotic element in the *Amours*. Laumonier contended that the poet's love of Cassandre was merely "de tête," and that Marie was more generous in granting him her favors. M. Desonay shows Ronsard to be less demanding in his love of Marie, more resigned, much less sensuous than in the *Amours de Cassandre*. He finds the complaint, which is perhaps superficial, "du soupirant que son cruel destin condamne à soupirer sans trêve et sans espoir" (p. 50). He expresses his jealousy, to be sure, but M. Desonay considers this to be "chose d'amour-propre, et non d'amour" (p. 50). The poet's obsession with his love gives the impression "d'un pur exercice littéraire et qui s'exerce sur un amour de tête" (p. 56). For M. Desonay the prime reason why Ronsard abandoned Cassandre for Marie is that he had decided to change his style, to "écrire basement." He tells Marie even more frequently than Cassandre that he will make her immortal, and this cannot be interpreted as a sign of passion. "Ronsard se préoccupe surtout de sa propre statue, des lauriers qui ceindront son front" (p. 64). In short, M. Desonay expresses the results of his study of the *Amours de Marie* in a striking phrase: "Je cherchais l'homme, l'amoureux: je trouve un auteur" (p. 66).

Ronsard's adoption of the "stille bas" at this time was probably inspired in large part by his desire to make himself comprehensible to a larger public, and his new style was favorably received by his contemporaries. At the same time he forsakes the decasyllabic line for the alexandrine, in which he will achieve his highest perfection in the *Amours d'Hélène*. To M. Desonay he is now, in his thirty-second year, "un lyrique érotisant devenu grand poète" (p. 109), whose choice of the alexandrine coincides, for purely poetic reasons, with his abandonment of the vehement lyricism of the period of Cassandre. It will not be easy for some scholars to accept his conclusion that "Ronsard ne sera plus guère amoureux, désormais, que de sa poésie. Cassandre . . . c'était encore Ronsard amoureux de l'amour" (p. 119). But he tries to show that we get an impression of the poet's sincerity and emotion through the facility and smoothness of these sonnets. And he admits their unquestionable merits: "douceur," fine progress

in mastering the art of the alexandrine, considerable success in the use of interior rhyme. In short, "Ronsard amoureux de l'amour avait accepté de célébrer Cassandre; Ronsard amoureux de sa poésie a saisi le prétexte d'une idylle à Bourgueil. Mais c'est toujours Ronsard poète: du lyrique, nous avons passé à l'artiste" (p. 132).

The element of personal adventure impresses M. Desonay as a minor factor in the poems addressed to Sinope. Here "Ronsard est plus proche de nous parce qu'il s'est dégagé, dirait-on, d'une aventure qui nous touche désormais presque autant que lui" (pp. 165-66). He combines in these poems the "souffle" of the *Amours de Cassandre* and the technical perfection which he has achieved in the manipulation of the alexandrine. He presents here what might be called the first elements of his *Traité poétique des passions de l'amour*. But M. Desonay's analysis of the many efforts to identify Sinope leads him only to negative conclusions. He refutes convincingly the arguments of Blanchemain (Marguerite de France) and Roger Sorg (Cassandre), but offers no conjecture as to her true identity.

M. Desonay's analysis of the poems addressed to Isabeau de Limeuil and written for his friend Louis de Condé leads him to disagree with Laumonier's idea that the poet was at one time expressing his own love. But his chief contribution in the analysis of the poems to Isabeau, Marie Stuart, and Genève has to do with the technical, poetic, and even psychological qualities of the poet's work. The first two do not concern "Ronsard poète de l'amour," but the *amours de Genève* approach those written for Cassandre in their sensuous nature, and this enigmatic person represents an essential stage in the evolution of Ronsard's lyricism. At this stage, M. Desonay believes, Ronsard has come to consider the alexandrine the most appropriate verse for his *amours*, so Genève may be said to represent a step in his progress toward the masterpiece of his lyricism, the *Amours d'Hélène*.

Although some students of Ronsard may differ with the conclusions of M. Desonay, as he disagrees with those of Laumonier and Chamard, it is certain that the poet's revisions have never been studied so thoroughly and so systematically as in the chapter devoted to "Ronsard autocorrecteur." The approach is, necessarily, subjective, but the reader who follows M. Desonay step by step will not often question the validity of his judgments. During the period of Marie he finds that "c'est . . . le métier qui prend le pas sur l'inspiration" (p. 254). Generally speaking, the older Ronsard gets, the worse his corrections become. Sometimes he improves his verses, then retouches them badly. This "diabolique persévérance qu'apporte Ronsard à s'enlaidir" (p. 257) leads to the conclusion that his corrections are bad seven times out of nine. His changes are likely to fall into certain categories: in his corrections he uses fewer repetitions of words, he suppresses interjections and enjambements, he corrects "à contre-courant du lyrisme," he corrects in such a way as to check the movement of his *vis lyrica*, he suppresses connective words such as "car," "et," and "lequel," he even makes a certain number of *contre-sens* in correcting himself. In all these generalizations M. Desonay is reflecting primarily his own taste. As with Ronsard, this taste may vary with age, and it is not inconceivable that he might wish to revise his chapter ten years hence, but there is little reason to believe that his analysis will not supersede all previous judgments on the quality of Ronsard's revisions.

With the publication of M. Desonay's third volume on the *Amours d'Hélène*, there is little doubt that we will have an evaluation of Ronsard's lyricism which



will replace many of the old generalizations of anthologies and manuals of literary history. His debt to the literary historians of past generations is great, and he has taken full advantage of it. His study could scarcely have been accomplished without the groundwork of Laumonier's critical edition. But in one respect M. Desonay strikes us as unique. He has certainly devoted more attention to the study and analysis of Ronsard's own texts than have any of the previous scholars in this field.

It is to be hoped that M. Desonay will include in his study of the *Amours d'Hélène* an index to all three volumes of *Ronsard poète de l'amour*.

SAMUEL F. WILL

Indiana University

*The Embattled Philosopher: A Biography of Denis Diderot.* By LESTER G. CROCKER. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1954. Pp. 442. \$6.50.

*Two Diderot Studies: Ethics and Esthetics.* By LESTER G. CROCKER. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures, Extra Volume XXVII, 1952. Pp. viii + 127. \$2.50.

Mr. Crocker has done, finally, what has needed doing for some time. He has written a book, and a good one, on the life of Diderot. It is, at once, sufficiently complete to satisfy the scholar and more than sufficiently readable to attract the intelligent general reader. May one hope that now the name Diderot will no longer elicit blank expressions in otherwise well-read American circles.

Mr. Crocker is no newcomer to Diderot scholarship, and one feels that his biography is the end result of an intimate friendship with the philosopher and of a cherished project which has stretched over the years. His valuable *Correspondance de Diderot* (1939) has remained an important prerequisite in modern Diderot criticism. The studies in Diderot's ethics and aesthetics—the two considerations which lie at the very heart of understanding the writer—were clearly a step of clarification and *mise-à-point* in the preparation of the biography.

This reviewer, following Mr. Crocker's own gracious and pertinent invitation in the foreword of *Two Diderot Studies* ("Where my conclusions err, I invite others to present their viewpoints. Above all, let us eschew dogmatism in our interpretation of this most undogmatic of thinkers"), here takes exception to some of the ideas expressed in that earlier study which appear—sometimes in slightly changed form—in *The Embattled Philosopher*.

That Diderot has been generally portrayed as a brilliant head full of paradox and moral dilemma is common knowledge. Mr. Crocker's well-documented attempt to show, in the case of the ethics, that they find some kind of resolution or synthesis in the last decade of Diderot's life, and that, on the contrary, the aesthetic ideas cannot and should not be coaxed toward any resolution (as Yvon Belaval has tried to do), seems strangely inconsistent. For the confusion, contradictions, or difficulties in Diderot's most intimate thinking and feeling which pose the problem of unifying his ethical ideas are, in great part, the same difficulties which appear in his aesthetic theories. It cannot be repeated too often that with Diderot one must not search for, nor attempt to reconstruct, a system. Conversely, one should not assume that there is, therefore, nothing but a flood of unrelated moments of fervid imagination. With him, as with every man, in a sense, the safest and the simplest method of investigation is to discover to which idea or ideas he most frequently returns. Unlike Rousseau whose



complete works are already seeded in his *First Discourse*, unlike Voltaire in whose writings one can trace a development of ideas accompanying changing adaptations to interior and exterior pressures, with Diderot one can speak of development of ideas only if one sees that from beginning to end those ideas will remain constantly surrounded by their limitations or "contradictions," and that the strengthening of any central idea implies only its continued assertion in a richer and wider investigation of its limitations.

It is particularly the use of the word humanism, as Mr. Crocker defines it, which confuses a section of his otherwise clear and objective presentation of Diderot's ethical ideas. For Mr. Crocker (p. 46), the highest good of the humanist is not life but "realization of the specifically human and rational in man, involving a concept he calls virtue." This he places in stark contradiction to the materialistic core of Diderot's thought, which is uniquely concerned with physical pleasure and happiness. By such juxtaposition he seems to have missed the most difficult—but also, to be sure, the most important—attempt at synthesis in Diderot's thought. Here there is another problem of terminology. As Mr. Crocker has seen, it is in *Jacques le fataliste* and contemporaneous or subsequent works like the *Réfutation d'Helvétius* where Diderot comes closest to rejecting materialism; where, in effect, he does reject what Crocker calls mechanistic determinism. But Crocker, quoting Urban (*Fundamentals of Ethics*) and Whitehead (*Science and the Modern World*), is convinced that mechanistic determinism is the only determinism. Crocker finds that there is "confusion" in this reviewer's study of *Jacques (The Determined Fatalist)* when the reviewer says that Diderot's determination allows for self-determination or "moral freedom." This, Mr. Crocker adds, is meaningless unless the reviewer meant "simply the entrance of the individual factor as an *additional* determinant, itself necessary and mechanical." But this is precisely what the reviewer did say about the matter (*The Determined Fatalist*, pp. 130 ff.), with the exception that for Diderot that additional determinant is not mechanical. It is here that virtue takes on its true meaning for Diderot (and not in the Master's notion of altruism with which a too-honest Diderot has seemed to confound Crocker). That addition itself is produced materialistically, to be sure, out of a past experience of recorded data in that segment of human matter which has become the thinking organ. Thus Diderot, in his own thinking, sees logically no contradiction in the idea of a humanism (man, for materialistic reasons, as the special, privileged center of an indifferent cosmos) which contained virtue as well as physical efficiency and well-being. But he remained uncertain as to whether all the steps in such a determined system could ever be proved, and this honesty of doubt produces the wealth of limitation and seeming refutation of his own convictions which are his dialogues. To him, the lacunae left by those doubts were no more serious than the imponderable intuitiveness of Rousseau's conscience and the spiritual imperatives of revealed religion.

*The Embattled Philosopher* is planned in such a way as to follow Diderot's thinking chronologically in terms of his life. It is an excellent procedure, although a difficult and somewhat dangerous one. In general, the author has been highly successful at it. There are, however, evidences of two weaknesses either in the form of presentation itself or in Mr. Crocker's occasional and momentary slips in the use of it. The first is that he is sometimes drawn into abandoning his own system, perhaps in the desire to be complete in his treatment of a particular idea at any given time. Thus, in the discussion of the *Lettre sur les aveugles*, he allows his discussion to include the *Eléments de*

*Physiologie* (p. 99).<sup>\*</sup> The second weakness of such a procedure lies in the tendency to create compartments. Thus (pp. 316-17), although true in general or in point of degree, Mr. Crocker's chronological compartmentation of Diderot's thought into philosophy, literary and aesthetic production, materialism and science, followed by a return to philosophy or metaphysical speculation, seems somehow too nicely arranged to present the facts fairly. For as far as one can know from existing documents, Diderot never stopped thinking about God and first causes, nor (and more vital to his works) about man as the center of privileged interest, whatever the rational explanation (pp. 404-405—Mr. Crocker speaks of Diderot's "new view" about the time of *Jacques*).

The most serious criticism to be leveled at the book as a whole (perhaps a personal feeling of the reviewer) is that Mr. Crocker does not seem quite sure how he will treat his subject—warmly, sympathetically, and subjectively, or with detached objectivity. It is certainly not necessary to agree with or even feel sympathy for the subject of a biography. And it is possible to write a valuable partisan study. Mr. Crocker seems at times to be launched on a warm identification with his subject, only to stop abruptly and point out, coldly, where the fallacy of Diderot's thought lies in a particular case. The criticism is not that he attempts occasional objective clarification but that such clarification is not always objective, not always as factual as the author seems to suggest. In short, one feels there are times when Mr. Crocker is writing a book for the lovers of Diderot; at other times, he would seem to be appeasing the anti-Diderot group—and in both cases with arguments which are more "partis pris" than objective information (p. 58: "Christian morality"; p. 64: "Diderot does not take into account . . ."). There are rare moments when one feels suddenly that somehow over the years Mr. Crocker has dulled his first enthusiasm for Diderot, that he presents some parts of his man almost apologetically as one might explain away a youthful amorous indiscretion (e.g., p. 333).

There are several points of obscurity or disagreement which are listed here for what they are worth. Mr. Crocker assures us continually that Diderot always held that "our ignorance is neither judge nor limit of the things that be." Yet, in the same paragraph (p. 57) he admits that Diderot violates this himself, probably referring, among other difficulties, to the philosopher's insistence in a later discussion on holding to materialism *and* virtue, a combination Mr. Crocker proves to be a weakness and an impossibility. Why does Diderot's own insistence on the non-finality of human wisdom not help us to understand the seeming contradiction? In the use of terms like Christianity (p. 62) and religion (*passim*), the author seems always to imply organized religion and revealed religion. Perhaps in a discussion of Diderot, one would gain by defining one's terms more closely. The same is true of the word atheism which Mr. Crocker equates only to the absence of a benevolent god or a good designer.

It is superficially valid, perhaps, to say that Diderot, in his enlargement of the atomic thinking of Epicurus and Lucretius, "approaches closer, in a sense, to Bergson" (p. 98). Much depends on the interpretation of "in a sense." The same is true for Mr. Crocker's discussion of the *Lettre sur les aveugles* (p. 100), where he sees in the "knowledge of objects as an 'intuition of mind'" as "separated from our sensual awareness" a Cartesian rather than a Lockean development. Descartes was clearly present in eighteenth-century rationalism, but the generalization can be carried too far. In the same discussion (p. 108), there seems to be no need of "probably" in "But Diderot's intention is probably not to support Berkeleyan idealism." The consequent treatment of the role of

the mind in the knowledge-process which has Diderot "on the road to Kant's rejoinder to the idealists" needs clarification and limitation.

Crocker's attempt to judge dispassionately the "metaphysical acrobatics . . . to spiritualize matter without giving the impression of doing so" (p. 141) seems written in bad faith, or suffers from a choice of terms dictated by his personal feelings. Especially questionable, if understandable at all, is his sentence "The eighteenth century theory was also nonchalant in overlooking what is distinctive in life—design, persistence, and purposiveness (related to the possession of needs, a *unique* characteristic), consequently behavior." The same is true of Mr. Crocker's insistence upon reading "universal" into the desires of Diderot and of the eighteenth century in general. Thus, as on page 263, he forgets that all scientific method shows a similar coupling of rationalism and "limited findings of an approved experimental method," and thereby exaggerates the contradictory side of the *philosophe*. Of the crucial encounter of determinism with ethics (discussed above), the author has given a much clearer statement in *The Embattled Philosopher* (p. 405), although he makes use of the term "moral freedom" in much the same sense in which he had criticized it in the earlier study on ethics (cf. also *The Determined Fatalist*, p. 132).

There are minor points of doubt, but of the kind which are either completely subjective or dependent on still uncertain facts of Diderot's life. For example, not all critics accept the three tracts on opera as Diderot's (p. 129), nor are they all in agreement that Diderot "had only a limited technical knowledge of music" (p. 130). Romantic melodrama and realistic problem plays (p. 185) both grow out of Diderot's theory of drama just as the latter grew out of the former. The "supposed" hoax involved in the *Religieuse* (p. 265) is not sufficiently explained. The author's discussion of Diderot's probable intentions in writing the *Neveu* (p. 273) seems very tenuous and labored; one cannot be so sure that "Diderot's intention in writing this dialogue was not philosophical. . . ." Nor is it completely clear that Diderot's self-imposed limitations on his optimism for the future of man "undoubtedly represents Catherine's influence. . . ." Finally, in the use of rich documentation and quotation, always without indication of source, Mr. Crocker uses (p. 317), at the outset of a vitally important discussion on "The Philosophy of Materialism," the final passage from the *Dialogue avec l'abbé Barthélemy*, first "revealed" in print in 1921. It is not at all certain that the dialogue was written by Diderot; a close study of interior evidence alone makes it almost surely not his work (cf. this reviewer's paper read at the Los Angeles meetings of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, 1954).

In a book of over 400 pages, which attempts to make a readable synthesis of an elusive writer and his relationship to a whole movement in Western culture, the foregoing objections assume a properly minor role. For nothing has been said of the masterly fashion in which Mr. Crocker has presented the rest of his material. His treatment of Diderot's domestic life, for example, is excellent and filled with warm justice. The presentation of the vipers' tangle centering about Mme d'Epinay manages to give the facts clearly and objectively. The way in which he has taken advantage of all the rich anecdotal material, weaving it easily into the general movement of the book, is ingenious. The conclusion can only be, despite the minor points of dispute, a reiteration of the opening sentence. Mr. Crocker has finally filled a lacuna, and filled it well—both for the scholar and student, and the reading public.

University of California

J. ROBERT LOY

*Benito Pérez Galdós and the Creative Process.* By WALTER T. PATTISON.  
Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954. Pp. ix + 146. \$3.50.

Combining evidence gathered in two of Galdós' earliest novels, *Gloria* and *Marianela*, with data gleaned from a first-hand examination of the personal library of the famous nineteenth-century Spanish novelist and from his own observations in Spain itself, Professor Pattison has produced one of the most interesting and at the same time scholarly works on Pérez Galdós yet published.

Rejecting Galdós' own comment that his novels "just came to him," Pattison has succeeded in proving that "Galdós as a creative writer did not create out of nothing. Stored in his mind was an immense amount of material—some derived from reading, some of it personal observations of men, buildings, and cities . . . some of it half-forgotten recollections of speeches in the Ateneo or Congreso, of conversations with friends, of newspaper accounts." From this mass of material, according to Professor Pattison, Galdós' novels were crystallized. In the case of *Gloria*, Pattison suggests that the crystallization may have taken place, as Galdós claims, at a single moment as he passed through the Puerta del Sol on his way to the Café Universal; but the crystallization was just a matter of the orderly arrangement into their proper place in the novel of materials already familiar to Galdós and consciously or subconsciously remembered.

Perhaps the strongest point in Pattison's work is his reference to the influence of Octave Feuillet's *Histoire de Sibylle* on *Gloria*—an influence which leads Professor Pattison to say: "Don Benito may have deliberately read or reread his copy of *Sibylle*—knowing that it dealt with the religious theme—with the specific purpose of finding material he could utilize in a projected novel on religion. This last possibility might bring the word 'plagiarism' to mind. Yet, despite the ugly implication, I feel that that is exactly what Galdós did. . . ." This use of such a harsh term as "plagiarism" may seem somewhat "chocante" to admirers of Pérez Galdós, but Professor Pattison softens his meaning by going on to say that "if we were fortunate enough to have the necessary documents, I believe we could prove that almost every work of literature is made up, as far as raw material is concerned, in exactly the way that Galdós proceeded. This would be particularly true of the use of literary 'borrowings.'"

Professor Pattison's analysis of Galdós' creative technique gives the very definite impression that the gulf between the "creative writer" and the "research scholar" is not so great as is generally believed. By removing the mystery with which authors like Galdós surround themselves, Pattison has shown that "an artist must work with *something*, not create out of *nothing*," and this "something" is the documentary information collected through the study, research, and experience of the novelist.

*Benito Pérez Galdós and the Creative Process* is a work that will be welcomed not only by students of Spanish literature, but by all who are interested in a better understanding of the processes involved in literary creativity.

J. CHALMERS HERMAN

East Central Oklahoma State College  
Ada, Oklahoma

## BOOKS RECEIVED

### AMERICAN

- Allen, Gay Wilson, and Charles T. Davis (editors). *Walt Whitman's Poems: Selections with Critical Aids*. New York: New York University Press, 1955. Pp. x + 280. \$3.75.
- Falk, Robert P. (editor). *American Literature in Parody: A Collection of Parody, Satire, and Literary Burlesque of American Writers Past and Present*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1955. Pp. 279. \$3.75.
- Richards, Robert Fulton (editor). *Concise Dictionary of American Literature*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. Pp. vii + 253. \$5.00.

### ENGLISH

- Blanchard, Rae (editor). *The Englishman: A Political Journal* by Richard Steele. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1955. Pp. xxii + 497. 50s.; \$8.00.
- Herrick, Marvin T. *Tragicomedy: Its Origin and Development in Italy, France, and England*. Urbana: University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. 39, 1955. Pp. vii + 331. \$5.00, cloth; \$4.00, paper.
- Ketton-Cremer, R. W. Thomas Gray: A Biography. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1955. Pp. xiii + 310. \$4.75.
- Kirschbaum, Leo. *Shakespeare and the Stationers*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, Graduate School Monographs, Contributions in Languages and Literature, No. 15, Fifth in the English Series, 1955. Pp. x + 421.
- Meyer, Gerald Dennis. *The Scientific Lady in England, 1650-1760: An Account of Her Rise, with Emphasis on the Major Roles of the Telescope and Microscope*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955. Pp. xi + 126. \$2.25.
- Nicoll, Allardyce (editor). *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study & Production*. Vol. 8. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1955. Pp. viii + 172. \$3.75.
- Quintana, Ricardo. *Swift: An Introduction*. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1955. Pp. viii + 204. \$4.25.
- Schoenbaum, Samuel. *Middleton's Tragedies: A Critical Study*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955. Pp. ix + 275. \$4.50.
- Sells, A. Lytton. *The Italian Influence in English Poetry: From Chaucer to Southwell*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955. Pp. 346. \$6.75.
- Sledd, James H., and Gwin J. Kolb. *Dr. Johnson's Dictionary: Essays in the Biography of a Book*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955. Pp. viii + 256. \$5.00.
- Texas, University of. *Studies in English*. Vol. XXXIII, 1954. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1955. Pp. 118. \$1.00.
- Wilson, John Dover, and George Ian Duthie (editors). *Romeo and Juliet*. Cambridge: At the University Press, Works of Shakespeare, edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, 1955. Pp. liii + 249. \$3.00.

### GERMAN

- Clark, Robert T., Jr. *Herder: His Life and Thought*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955. Pp. vi + 501. \$6.50.
- Kremer, Edmund P. *German Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases with Their English Counterparts*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955. Pp. viii + 116. \$3.00.

- Mummendey, Richard. Language and Literature of the Anglo-Saxon Nations as Presented in German Doctoral Dissertations, 1885-1950. A Bibliography. Bonn, Germany: H. Bouvier and Company for the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1954. Pp. xvi + 200.
- Nicholls, R. A. Nietzsche in the Early Works of Thomas Mann. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 45, 1955. Pp. 119. \$1.70.
- Rich, Norman, and M. H. Fisher (editors). The Holstein Papers. Vol. I: Memoirs and Political Observations. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1955. Pp. xxvii + 216. \$5.00.
- Rowley, Brian A. (editor). Novalis: Three Works: *Die Lehrlinge zu Sais; Blütenstaub; Die Christenheit oder Europa*. Cambridge: At the University Press, Cambridge Plain Texts, 1955. Pp. viii + 99. \$0.75.
- Scholl, Inge. *Die Weiße Rose*. Edited by Erika Meyer. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1955. Pp. xi + 129. \$1.60.
- Spalding, Keith. An Historical Dictionary of German Figurative Usage. Fascicle 5: bändigen-Beispiel. With the Assistance of Kenneth Brooke. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Pp. 185-232. 10s. 6d.

## ROMANCE LANGUAGES

- Bonno, Gabriel. Les Relations intellectuelles de Locke avec la France (d'après des documents inédits). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 38, No. 2, 1955. Pp. 37-264. \$2.50.
- Crabb, Daniel M. A Comparative Study of Word Order in Old Spanish and Old French Prose Works. A dissertation. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1955. Pp. xviii + 66.
- Cuttino, G. P. (translator). I Laugh Through Tears: The Ballades of François Villon. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. Pp. xiv + 65. \$3.50.
- Deloffre, Frédéric (editor). Marivaux: Le Petit-Maitre Corrigé. Texte publié avec une introduction et commentaire. Genève: Librairie Droz; Lille: Librairie Giard, Textes Littéraires Français, 1955. Pp. 292.
- Griffith, T. Gwynfor. Bandello's Fiction: An Examination of the *Novelle*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Pp. vii + 147. 25s.
- Havens, George R. The Age of Ideas: From Reaction to Revolution in Eighteenth-Century France. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955. Pp. x + 474. \$4.50.
- Hesse, Everett W. (editor). El Mayor Monstro los Celos: A Critical and Annotated Edition from the Partly Holographic Manuscript of D. Pedro Calderón de la Barca. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1955. Pp. xi + 249. \$3.75.
- Hoge, Henry W. (editor). Lope de Vega: *El Principe Despeñado*: A Critical and Annotated Edition of the Autograph Manuscript. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, Humanities Series, No. 33, 1955. Pp. x + 188. \$4.00.
- Leo, Ulrich. Rómulo Gallegos: Estudio sobre el Arte de Novelar. Ediciones Humanismo en Homenaje a Rómulo Gallegos. México, 1954. Pp. 188.
- Pagnucco, A. The Genius of Leonardo. The Inaugural Lecture of the Leonardo da Vinci Centenary Celebrations held at the University of Witwatersrand under the Auspices of the Dante Alighieri Society and the S.A. Association for the Advancement of Science. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1954. Pp. 19.

- Peyre, Henri. *The Contemporary French Novel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955. Pp. xvi + 363. \$5.00.
- Ruff, Marcel A. *Baudelaire: L'Homme et l'œuvre*. Paris: Hatier-Boivin, Connaissance des Lettres 41, 1955. Pp. 211.
- Sayers, Dorothy L. *Introductory Papers on Dante*. With a Preface by Barbara Reynolds. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. Pp. xix + 225. \$4.00.
- Simpson, Lesley Byrd (translator). *The Celestina: A Novel in Dialogue*. Translated from the Spanish. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955. Pp. x + 162. \$3.50.
- Smith, William Jay (translator). *Valery Larbaud: Poems of a Multimillionaire*. Bonacio & Saul with Grove Press, 1955. Pp. x + 72. \$3.00.
- Thérond, M. *Du Tac au tac: Réflexes et Images de la conversation française actuelle*. Préface de Charles Bruneau. Paris: Marcel Didier, 1955. Pp. 207.
- Turnbull, Eleanor L. (editor). *Ten Centuries of Spanish Poetry: An Anthology in English Verse with Original Texts from the XIth Century to the Generation of 1898*. With Introductions by Pedro Salinas. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1955. Pp. xv + 452. \$5.00.

## GENERAL

- Aston, S. C. (editor). *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies*. By a Number of Scholars. Vol. XV, 1953. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1955. Pp. viii + 492. \$8.50.
- Bayerschmidt, Carl F., and Lee M. Hollander (translators). *Njáls Saga*. Translated from the Old Icelandic, with Introduction and Notes. Washington Square, New York: New York University Press for the American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1955. Pp. xii + 390.
- Friederich, Werner P. *Outline of Comparative Literature from Dante Alighieri to Eugene O'Neill*. With the collaboration of David Henry Malone. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature, No. 11, 1954. Pp. 451. \$6.00.
- Jakobson, Roman. *Slavic Languages: A Condensed Survey*. Second edition. New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University Slavic Studies, 1955. Pp. 36. \$0.80.
- Johnson, Walter (translator). *Strindberg's Queen Christina; Charles XII; Gustav III*. Seattle: University of Washington Press; New York: American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1955. Pp. vii + 282. \$4.50.
- Macdonald, Margaret (editor). *Philosophy and Analysis: A Selection of Articles Published in Analysis Between 1933-40 and 1947-53*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. Pp. viii + 296. \$7.50.
- Powell, Hugh (editor). *Andreas Gryphius: Carolus Stuardus*. Leicester: University College, 1955. Pp. cxli + 132. 30s.
- Wellek, René. *A History of Modern Criticism, 1750-1950*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955. Vol. I: *The Later Eighteenth Century*. Pp. ix + 358. \$4.50. Vol. II: *The Romantic Age*. Pp. v + 459. \$5.50. Each volume available separately.



MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
SEATTLE 5

Malcolm Brown      Partridge Hall

---

Entered at Postoffice as Second Class Matter, Seattle, Washington

